

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XXIV. No. 15 }
WHOLE No. 592 }

January 29, 1921

{ \$4.00 A YEAR
PRICE, 10 CENTS }

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE	345-348
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
The Nature of the Church—Social Equality and Catholic Schools—The Glow of Faith in Czechoslovakia—The New Menace of the Smith-Towner Bill—The Ku Klux Comedians. 349-357	
COMMUNICATIONS	357
EDITORIALS	
The Fordham University Drive—For Catholic Employers—A Dying Race—Reunion in New York—The "Amended" Smith-Towner Bill. 358-360	
LITERATURE	
Two Books on Lincoln—Snow Clad Pines—Reviews—Books and Authors 361-365	
EDUCATION	
The Government and Education 365-366	
SOCIOLOGY	
The War Against the Unions..... 366-367	
NOTE AND COMMENT	367-368

Chronicle

Central America.—Dispatches of January 23 to the metropolitan press from San Salvador, Republic of San Salvador, and San José, the Costa Rican capital, brought important news with regard to the Central American republics. According to the information given, the compact creating the Union of Central American Republics was signed by delegates of four of the nations at the San José conference, San Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala and Costa Rica. The delegates of the five Central American republics had for some time been conferring over the matter in the capital of Costa Rica. At the last moment, however, the Nicaraguan delegates not only failed to sign the compact but, on the orders of their government, withdrew from the conference. All five delegations had come to an agreement on the long-disputed article of the covenant, says a San José dispatch to *El Diario del Salvador*, but the Nicaraguan Government would not confirm the action of its delegates. According to the *New York Times*, the article in all probability is that dealing with signatories and foreign nations, which Nicaragua had interpreted as affecting her dealings with the United States.

England.—According to a special cable from London,

unemployment in England is increasing rapidly. According to the *Manchester Guardian* conditions are now serious. It is stated that the number of men, women, boys and girls who are registered as totally out of work is close upon a million. This figure is conservative, being based on official lists, and does not take into consideration workers on odd jobs and short time men, who probably are more numerous than those totally unemployed. The dependents on both classes considerably swell the volume of those who must be taken into account in dealing with the problem. Everywhere a remedy to the evil is sought. The Government invited the Labor Party to collaborate in devising some helpful plan to meet the situation. The Labor party, actuated as some at least pretend, by political motives, refused to act in conjunction with the Government Commission, charged the Government with having failed to provide in good time against an evident contingency, and promulgated a scheme of its own, which roughly amounted to the demand that every householder out of work should receive a weekly dole of two pounds, and each single man or woman unemployed should get twenty-five shillings. Labor pronouncements went on to declare that the opening of trade with Russia and the "abolition of capitalism" were the real solvents of the situation.

According to the correspondent of the *New York Times*, new markets or the revival of old ones, are recognized to be the one means of coping with the unemployment problem. Recently several large businesses stopped their export work. With this phase of the problem, the Government is striving to deal by seeking the cooperation of banks and insurance companies carrying on a scheme along the lines suggested by Ter Meulen, the Dutch economist, whereby credits could be opened for those continental countries which want goods for which they are at present unable to pay. Sir Lynden Macassey, lecturer on economics of London University, declares that the necessity of dealing immediately with the problem is urgent. According to him, a new gospel is in the air. That gospel, he says, was preached only sporadically before the war, but is now trumpeted broadcast. Unemployment, he writes, according to the new industrial evangelists, is wholly due to the capitalistic organization of society and of industry. "Destroy and replace the latter by any kind of Socialistic commonwealth and work will drop like manna from heaven." That insinuating appeal, he continues, of every brand of Socialism in existence and the spread of unemployment are relied upon by revolutionaries in England as the essential means of overturn-

ing the Constitution. This attempt, he concludes, to exploit unemployment makes it essential that all classes of the community should cooperate with a view to its reduction by sane and solvent methods to the lowest possible limits.

In extremist circles, it is stated that by the end of March unemployment will have reached such a dangerous stage that the country will be ripe for a revolution. The best observers, however, do not place much credence in the stories of a bloody uprising. But the situation is on all sides recognized as acute. The view taken by the Government is that, pending results which may be hoped for from the conferences which Sir Robert Horne and the Board of Trade held with leading financial and industrial authorities, everything possible must be done to alleviate distress and thereby mitigate immediate perils. The Labor Ministry has already devised several practical plans to relieve the situation and to prevent anything like starvation or real want.

France.—Premier Aristide Briand presented the program of his Ministry to the Chamber of Deputies and Senate on January 20. The program contains four out-

*The Briand
Program*

standing points, namely: Germany must disarm and pay the reparations due from her. France has the force to compel respect for the engagements taken with her, and would be able to use it, if necessary, but it is in peace that she wants to bring Germany to fulfill her obligations. Peace with Turkey must be made effective, account being taken of the new circumstances affecting that country. France does not intend to interfere in the internal affairs of Russia, but cannot admit that the Soviet armies shall cross the Russian frontiers to attack the allies of France. Promises of economy, renovation of the financial administration and intensified reconstruction of the devastated regions made up the rest of the program. The outline as given by the new Premier seemed to satisfy the great majority of the members of Parliament. The Chamber expressed its unmistakable approval when M. Briand stated that the prosperity of Germany, the aggressor, in contrast with the ruin of the victorious people would be a challenge which France could not tolerate. Some criticism was offered as to the composition of the new Cabinet, and pointed references were made by several of the members to the antagonism shown by the Premier to the working classes.

Referring to the relations of France and the United States, M. Briand declares that the imperishable bonds formed on the battlefields during the great struggle will "guarantee our union in peace as in war." He was sure, he added, that their American friends will give them for the reparation of the damages they sustained, the same support that decided the victory in the great war, in which, side by side, Frenchmen and Americans defended the cause of civilization. Referring to the attitude of the United States towards the League of Nations, the ministerial declaration stated that it respected

the scruples which made America hesitate to give its approval to a given League of Nations "of which, however, the United States had never doubted the generous and beneficent principles." The declaration expressed confidence that England would aid all she could to bring about an understanding between the Allies, which is a prime necessity to the settlement of all questions concerning peace now in suspense.

On January 21, the day following the presentation of the ministerial program, after a lively debate on its various articles, the Premier received a vote of confidence in the Chamber of Deputies of 475 to 68, one of the strongest votes of confidence ever given to a French Government. M. Briand thus enters the interallied negotiations with the full backing of Parliament. But on the thorny question of reparations, the leaders of the various parties gave the new Premier clearly to understand that they would not fail to withdraw their present vote of confidence and overthrow his Ministry if he did not obtain satisfactory results. Replying to an interpellation, M. Briand let it be known that at the interallied conference, he would continue the fight of France to delay beyond May 1 the fixing of the total Germany indemnity. The reason given by the Premier was the one so often given by French statesmen and economists, that with Germany at a low ebb it was no time to estimate what she could pay. While indefinite in his statements, he indicated that he would favor fixing what Germany owed theoretically, and later determining what she could pay, insisting for the present on five annuities of 3,000,000,000 marks each. After dealing with the question of reparations and the internal situation of the country, the Premier said that he would support the project for resumption of diplomatic relations with the Vatican which has already met the approval of the Chamber of Deputies.

Germany.—A detailed list of the supplies turned over to the Allies in execution of the Treaty of Versailles, during the first year of its operation, has just been issued

by the Reparations Commission. The chief item is coal, amounting in all to 17,818,840 tons. Dyestuffs are second in the list, with a total of 10,787,827 kilos. Other deliveries of importance were: steamers, sailing vessels and fishing boats, 2,054,729 tons; inland navigation materials, 38,730 tons; livestock, 360,176 head; seed, 6,802,588 kilos; ammonium sulphate, 19,000 tons; pharmaceutical products, 57,823 kilos; rolling stock, 4,571; trucks, 129,555; fixed railway materials, 140,000 tons; and agricultural machinery, 131,505. Furthermore, in accordance with Article 238 binding Germany to effect restitution of objects of every nature and of securities and cash taken away, seized or sequestered, large additional deliveries of agricultural and industrial machinery, of locomotives and trucks were made to France and Belgium, besides securities, furniture and objects of art. The figures recently published of payments against the 20,000,000,000 gold marks, payable under Article 235,

are said to be in excess of the reality. In the general allocation of the reparations commission France received the largest share, with Belgium second and Italy third. The United States appears on the list with two articles: 1,300,802 kilos of dyestuffs and 1,314 lorries. Great Britain received 1,477,839 gross tons of shipping, 3,113,802 kilos of dyestuffs and 1,243 lorries.

Hungary.—Reference has occasionally been made in the press to a suicide mania prevalent in Hungary. The pre-war figures for suicides were from fifty to sixty yearly. Police reports for 1920 now show that 3,200 women and 2,100 men took their own lives during the course of the last year, while 10,000 more unsuccessful attempts at suicide were made. This situation is attributed to the deterioration in living conditions and to the fact that the war cheapened human life in the popular mind. The ultimate reason must of course be found in a serious religious decadence. Sermons are being preached upon this subject and a special police force has been organized by the Government to keep strict watch and prevent suicides. It is said that in a number of cases where the police intervened in time, the tyrannous oppression of the authorities was given as a reason for the attempted suicide. The fact is that the stable Government which followed upon the Bolshevik tyranny saved the country from a régime of loot and murder to which many would probably wish to return. A godless radicalism has robbed them of religion and thrown them into despair. It must be remembered, too, that a systematic campaign of defamation has been carried on in the press against the Hungarian Government which nobly succeeded in restoring law and order to that much-afflicted country.

India.—To appease the complaints of the East Indians at the heavy taxes they have to pay in order to support the armies that England maintains in India, the

*Continued
Unrest*

Government has decided to demobilize some 500,000 men and 2,500 British officers. Non-official and native members of the Viceroy's Council carried through the measure, which is regarded by several English papers as a grave menace to British rule in India. For the natives have long been full of discontent owing to the high cost of necessities, prices having advanced in some instances 1,000 per cent, while incomes have increased very little. Bitterness has also been caused by the post-war maintenance of war-time restrictions, for the "Rowlatt" regulations, giving the Government powers almost as wide as those obtaining under martial law, are in force still. The natives' earnest desire to have more to say about governing themselves was partially gratified with the opening of this year, when the new Election act went into effect. Under its terms, 5,000,000 natives are enfranchised, that is about 1.5 per cent of the entire population may vote for candidates to the Legislative Coun-

cils and to the Indian Legislature. Far from being satisfied with this concession, the Indian National Congress, and the All-India Moslem League, two powerful bodies, demand that India should be declared an equal partner in the British Commonwealth, and should manage all India's affairs except the army and navy.

Ireland.—The usual dance of death is still on in Ireland. During the week ending January 14 there were eighty-nine casualties, twenty-two of these being among the Crown forces. Raids on mails dropped from forty-three, the previous week, to twenty-nine; raids for arms from fifteen to three; seventy-six arrests were made in connection with outrages and for political offences. Courts martial numbered 26, with 22 convictions, and 107 internment orders were issued. Last week the number of deaths was apparently considerably higher, but exact figures are not at hand. Among the late victims were two inmates of an internment camp, whose deaths were announced but not explained. Meantime the British dragnet is spread over Ireland. On January 16 and 17 10,000 citizens of Dublin were interned in their homes for thirty-six hours while an area of three square miles was harried by police and soldiers. Arrests are more numerous than ever. Dispatches of January 18 state that seventeen Sinn Fein members of the British Parliament are now in jail, while six members of the Irish Republican Parliament are in the United States, two are on the Continent, two have died and one has resigned. Tipperary, Cashel and Killmanaule have been proclaimed and, in Cork, the curfew rings at 5 o'clock P. M. The British Labor party has issued a supplementary report which once again puts the destruction of Cork squarely on the Crown. It also denounces Sir Hamar Greenwood's now famous picture of the battle of Tralee as a pure fraud and calls attention to the fact that British officials have begun to harass men who testified before the Labor Commission.

An account of the report as cabled to the New York *World* by its correspondent reads as follows:

The report declares: "The military know right well who burned Cork. What they do not know is how much evidence of their guilt has been collected and is in the possession of the Cork Corporation or the British Labor Commission. But they suspect. They can hardly hope this time to conceal all proof and terrorize the people into absolute silence. It is therefore probable that they will own up to just a little, perhaps make scapegoats of a few auxiliaries and completely exonerate the military and the police."

This report further makes the sensational charge that as the result of quarrelling and drunkenness there were casualties among the Crown forces implicated in the burning and looting, and states that there is evidence to show that 300 gallons of petrol were taken out of the Victoria barracks on the night of the burning of Cork.

Statements and depositions of the witnesses forming the basis of the report are said to be "chiefly of responsible commercial or professional men and householders. Some are English, some Americans and several are ex-officers or ex-soldiers."

It is necessary to conceal the witnesses' names and identity,

but the report adds: "In every case the signed and witnessed original is filed and deposited in a place of comparative safety. These originals will be produced for any competent and responsible commission of inquiry. And the recent inquiry established that hundreds of persons, who, in the prevailing state of lawless terrorism dare not sign any evidence against the military and police, would be prepared to come forward and give evidence. The evidence here presented is, as far as it goes, absolutely conclusive.

Summarized, the sworn statements make the following charges of actual incendiarism during the sack of Cork. "The auxiliaries set fire to a tram-car, which was cheered by a passing lorry of the military. Cash's store was burned by the police and auxiliaries who afterward danced and fired revolver shots outside it. The Munster Arcade was set on fire by the police under command of a military officer. The Black and Tans burned Roche's stores. The police attempted to set fire to the premises of Murphy Bros., and very nearly set fire to St. Augustine's priory and church.

"The City Hall and library, which is quite close to the Union Quay Barracks, was burned by the police, one of whom left his cap behind. An attempt was made to burn Jennings' store by men in uniform and civilian attire. The military refused to use their fire appliances. Thirty constables, including the head constable and three sergeants, kept turning off the water from the hose which was being played on the library.

"The police fired at a fireman. The police and auxiliaries fired at two firemen. The auxiliaries fired at a fireman. A fireman was wounded by a bullet in close proximity to the military and police. A drunken officer fired at a fireman. Other firemen also were fired upon by the Crown forces.

"Civilian helpers were fired at, molested and threatened by the police and auxiliaries. One policeman shouted to a hose worker, 'At your peril. Don't turn that hose on that fire; let it blaze.' Uniformed looters were seen emerging laden from Cash's. An auxiliary told an ex-officer that 'as Cash's had been so badly looted they were going to set it on fire in order to cover up the loot.'

"The police and military looted Mangan's and Hilser's and Murphy Bros., besides several public houses. The Crown's auxiliaries and police were seen taking loot to the Empress Place barracks and Union Quay barracks. Soldiers and Black and Tans looted Tyler's boot store."

The sworn statement of "P," fireman of U. S. S. of West Canon, an American, says that on the night of December 11 he saw from eight to twelve men in uniform dressed in long dark overcoats carrying short carbines proceeding in the direction of Patrick Street. Loud explosions got him out of bed about 11 o'clock.

"I heard a number of motor lorries pass by, and heard rifles and revolver shots interspersed with explosions. I went to my window on the top floor overlooking Patrick Street, and saw from twenty to thirty soldiers, some dressed in black overcoats and wearing round khaki caps, around the fire in front of Grant's. At the same time I saw two motor lorries on the street opposite the Victoria Hotel, and also a group of officers numbering up to twelve dressed in officers' khaki uniforms with Sam Brown belts, some wearing tasseled khaki caps, and others ordinary military caps. They carried automatic revolvers in their hands and were talking very loudly and making much noise. This group were to the right of the lorry. They appeared very excited and intoxicated. I saw firemen engaging with flames.

"At about 12.30 o'clock the bell of the hotel was ringing. I heard John, the porter, ask who is there. I did not answer, but heard a banging at the door. John then shouted United States American come down. We did so, and at that time he was trying to get the military barracks on the phone. He failed. Those at the door were admitted, and they proceeded into the

pantry, where a few drinks were served them. I heard the sergeant of those men, who were policemen, give his name as T. They were armed with carbines. The manager and one of the Woolworth's staff were present, and Sergeant T. pointed his carbine at the latter and commanded him to sing. He refused, although threatened. The sergeant was very intoxicated.

"They then went out on the street and remained outside the hotel door for some time. After that I saw no one on the streets but the military. I busied myself around the hotel, helping whenever I could to prevent the building from going up in fire."

The boatswain of the West Canon, another American witness in corroborating the statements of his shipmate, declares the sergeant in his presence threatened to shoot the proprietor of the hotel, but the boatswain says he was able to placate the sergeant, and adds: "From 9.50 P. M. I had not seen a single citizen on Patrick Street with the exception of one woman who advised us not to go up Patrick Street, as the Black and Tans were everywhere. Just as I entered the Victoria, I saw none but Crown forces."

On January 18 the Irish Labor party issued a manifesto to British Labor in which after reference to Britain's attempt to hold Ireland by reprisals of shootings, fire and other forms of tyranny occur these words:

Only such methods can prevail in attempting to govern without the consent of the governed. No generation has passed without protest since England claimed suzerainty. We demand freedom because we desire our political, cultural, social and economic life to develop in harmony with the genius of our people. Freedom means the right to choose, without outside intervention, the form of government under which the Irish nationals choose to live.

British workers are urged to take action immediately or else allow the name of British democracy to be linked in the minds of men with Czarism and Prussianism.

Organized Irish Labor stands in this struggle solidly with the Irish nation in arms against the yoke, for an entirely separate political entity.

Economic conditions will inevitably involve the closest relations between the two peoples. Great Britain's economic power, we recognize, is potent enough to enforce almost any terms on Ireland short of forfeiture of her honor and liberty. We shall all accept the British Labor Party's policy when it fulfills our demand for self-determination.

So far the British papers are for the most part silent about these fearful indictments of the British Government.

Italy.—The Communist section of the Italian Socialist party, defeated in its attempt to secure endorsement by the party of the Third International of Moscow, bolted

the Socialist convention which had been holding its sessions at Leghorn.

Communists Split from Socialists
The Communists immediately organized the Italian Communist party, which advocates violence, if necessary, to attain its ends. The vote on the question of joining the Moscow International was as follows: Socialists, against adherence to the International, 112,241; Communists, for adherence, 58,900. Bordiga, leader of the Communists, protested against what he alleged were irregularities in the voting, and declared that he would not accept the results, and that in adhering to the Third International he and his followers would fight the battle of the proletariat.

The Nature of the Church

H. B. LOUGHNAN, S.J.

IN this new country there are two characteristics which are often noted by the observant visitor. Antiquity has not of itself any special claim upon our reverence; we are accustomed to progress and change in almost every department of life; the mere fact that an institution is long established, that a particular system has long been in vogue, that an ideal or standpoint has been accepted for years without question, this does not guarantee its continuance. Again, the democratic origin and character of the American Constitution has stamped the citizen of the United States with the mark of freedom; he glories in this birthright, though at the same time he is most submissive to discipline, provided, of course, as is natural, that this authority springs ultimately from the people and is finally responsible to the people. Thus in America there is no military caste wielding power and demanding absolute obedience from citizens who do not confer and cannot control this right to rule.

Yet in the very midst of a free and democratic nation, we find an organization which has indeed developed with the years, but has not changed one jot or tittle of that which was given it by its Founder, a society which though truly democratic, in so far as therein a fisherman can hold highest honor, still never consents to stand at the bar of the people's tribunal: a ruling body which imposes obligations even upon the consciences of men, and yet has never for an instant admitted that it is indebted to its members for its power. This institution is the Catholic Church.

It may not be out of place to examine the nature of this wonderful body and to study her relations with the changing world around her. For there is perhaps a danger lest we forget that the Church has untrammelled authority and Divinely given power conferred directly by Christ, Our Lord; we may even come to regard the Church as an institution whose office begins with collecting money, and ends with the administration of the Sacraments; our very love of freedom may need to be chastened and restrained lest, even half unconsciously, we judge the Church by the same standards which we apply to any merely human society.

We shall, therefore, in these articles, three in number, set out the claims which the Church makes upon our obedience. In this first paper we shall deal with the nature of the Church, leaving for later treatment two branches of life which come under her influence, to wit: the family, and the individual. We may profitably limit our discussion to those characteristics of the Church which make her stand out in bold relief from her surroundings; hence after one or two preliminary remarks, we shall in the main confine ourselves to describing the nature of her authority. And as a further foreword we must note that we are not treating our subject from the

point of view of the controversialist, for we are writing for Catholics; thus we do not cite proof, but merely state the doctrine of the Church as found in her official pronouncements.

The institution of the Church by Our Lord was wholly His own personal work; He himself settled what was to be its teaching, its Sacramental system and its form of government; He did not commission others to found a Church in His name and with His authority. Moreover Christ, Our Lord, intended the Church to retain for ever the form He gave it; it cannot therefore make any radical change in its constitution. We shall later cite a passage to show that this doctrine is in striking opposition to the teaching of the "Modernist." In the meantime, however, we must be on our guard against extremes. For this essential conservatism of the Church does not exclude development; it does not mean that the Church is a lifeless institution without any relation to the modern society wherein she finds herself. No. There must be and ever has been development, rightly understood, both in her teaching and especially in her discipline and practices. On the one hand, what cannot be added to or detracted from, is the body of revealed doctrine given her to safeguard and interpret; she may make deductions from what has been revealed; she may encourage her children to speculate upon the truths of the Faith; for dogma does not mean intellectual stagnation as is clear from the immense volume of theological work which has poured out and is pouring out from the schools of her thinkers. On the other hand, what cannot be changed is her essential constitution. This only means that Christ intended His Church to retain all the essentials of that form in which He founded her; as for the rest, she may allow in one place what she forbids in another—the marriage of the clergy is a case in point; she may permit at one time what she prevents at another, as for example that the laity vote at the election of Bishops or the Pope.

We now come to treat of some of those qualities which if the Church lost, she would cease to be the society founded by Christ. What perhaps at first sight shocks the feeling of the average American is that in a certain sense all men are *not* equal in the Church; that is to say, the supreme authority of the Church is not held as though in trust from its members; when a Pope is elected, it is not from the body of voters that he obtains his rightful power to rule; thus for example, he could not be deposed after being duly installed; he gets his authority immediately and directly from Christ, Our Lord. And in like manner, the jurisdiction of a Bishop is not the gift of those who elected him; it is the gift of the Church's Founder, who confers it either immediately Himself or through the Roman Pontiff.

Thus in the nature of its authority the Church stands in striking contrast with the State; for, at least on the theory more commonly accepted, the authority of the State rests ultimately with the people, and these may not only decide in the beginning what form the constitution shall take, but also in certain conditions which are well defined and on the whole rare, may fundamentally alter that constitution. This however is not true of the Church; her members taken collectively do not confer upon the Roman Pontiff, nor upon the Bishops and priests who hold office under him, their authority. The heretical Synod of Pistoia stated that "power was given by God to the Church to be communicated to the pastors who are His ministers for the salvation of souls." Pius VI declared that this assertion was heretical, if it was taken to mean that "the power of the Church's ministry came to its pastors from the common body of the Faithful." In the case of Papal jurisdiction, the doctrine is even clearer. Thus we read in the Vatican Council: "If any one shall say that the Blessed Peter . . . received directly and immediately from the same Lord Jesus Christ a primacy only of honor and not one of true and proper jurisdiction, let him be anathema." And the canon of the next chapter states: "If any one shall say that it is not by the institution of Christ, that is, by Divine right, that Blessed Peter has successors in the primacy over the universal Church, or that the Roman Pontiff is not the successor of Blessed Peter in the same primacy, let him be anathema."

Therefore from the teaching of these two canons of the Vatican Council and from the condemnation of the Bishops of Pistoia, the Church's doctrine concerning her own constitution is clear; the supreme authority in that Church is not entrusted to the Pope by all or any particular one of its members; it comes directly from Christ, Our Lord. Secondly, the body of the Faithful does not confer upon the Bishops their power of ruling; this also comes from Christ—though theological opinion is not unanimous as to whether the Pope confers it out of the fulness of the powers given him by Christ, or whether it likewise come directly from Our Lord while its exercise is controlled by the Pope.

Now there is another point of difference between the governing power in the Church and that of many civic institutions. It consists in her monarchic character. Very briefly what is meant is this: The Pope's supreme authority, both as law-maker and as teacher, is independent of the Episcopate; his decrees do not have to wait for the acceptance of the body of Bishops before they can have binding force; similarly, though in making an infallible pronouncement on matters which concern faith or morals, the Pope is normally bound to consult the teaching body of the Church, viz. the Episcopate, yet the infallible character of such a decision is not restricted to the case where such advice has been sought.

This doctrine is closely connected with that of the primacy of Peter and of his successors in the See of

Rome; for the Roman Pontiff would not have "primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church" if his decisions had binding force not of themselves, but only because ratified by the Bishops of the Church.

As much of what we have hitherto stated is the very antithesis of the Modernist position, it may not be out of place to conclude this sketch by quoting from the Encyclical of Pius X wherein his Holiness gives a masterly exposition of that heresy:

They cry out that the Government of the Church in every respect must be reformed, especially in its disciplinary and dogmatic sides. Within and without it must be brought into harmony with the modern conscience, as they call it, which wholly tends to democracy; therefore their share in the Government must be granted to the inferior clergy and to the laity, and the authority now too much centralized, must be divided. They desire also that the Roman Congregations, especially those of the Holy Office and the Index, should be changed. They maintain also that the line of action of the ecclesiastical authority in political and social matters must be altered, so that, while it renounces all rights of interference in civil organizations it should yet at the same time adapt itself to them, that it may influence them with its spirit. In morals they adopt the tenet of the Americanists, that the active virtues ought be preferred to the passive, and that the exercise of the former ought to be promoted more than that of the latter. They ask the clergy, thus equipped, to return to the old humility and poverty; then in thought and action to accord with the teachings of Modernism . . .

It is well from time to time to recall such utterances; for we may forget that the organization of the Church, like the beauty of her God, is ever ancient, though always new.

Social Equality and Catholic Schools

WILLIAM M. MARKOE, S. J.

IT is only in the light of Christian principles that man's relationship with his fellow-men can be properly defined and adjusted. Passion, environment, and convention continually seek to wrench us away, in our attitude and viewpoint, from these fundamental criterions. We must periodically force ourselves to rise above human but powerful influences and harmonize our way of thinking and acting with simple justice. This is what all Christians more or less must do in their spiritual life, if they would save their souls. So, too, do they act in more profane matters, if they would act rationally.

In dealing with our race problem, there is ever lurking within men's minds the dread phantom of "social equality." As Dr. Du Bois, I believe, says, the Negro question cannot be mentioned but that the howl about "social equality" is raised. This is probably because social equality is a sensitive point with all races and peoples. It is usually based on legal distinctions, differences in wealth, education, and culture, or simply on ancestry and birth. That these forces should largely determine the company one keeps is natural and necessary. But, though they must be taken into consideration and produce their effect, these criterions of social recognition should always be subservient to what, in the eyes of a Catholic, ought to be a far more important

norm, that is, sound morality. Earthly standards change. Christian morality, as a norm, is lasting.

But if worldly standards must not be unduly stressed to determine mere social relationships, with much greater reason they must not be allowed unduly to affect our relationships with others in matters purely religious. Our social and religious connections are usually closely joined, accordingly we are apt to confuse the two and apply the principles, which of necessity largely govern the former, to the latter. To be affiliated with others in matters of religion is an entirely different thing from being associated with them in the circle of our family and social life. If the same principles governed the one as the other, Christ would have had to establish a separate church for each different grade of society. Instead He has established one supernatural, Catholic Church for all men. For certain obvious reasons we can justly exclude others from what is essentially the inner sanctum of our social life; but these reasons cannot have the least force or weight in affecting our spiritual union with them, and all that this necessarily implies in matters of religion.

Good Catholics in general do not have difficulty in understanding this truth when there is question of mere affiliation with the Church through the Sacrament of Baptism. If they did they would not generously support our missions to the most degraded outcasts of human society. So, too, this truth is generally understood and adhered to when it comes to the admission of all races and classes of society to Divine service in Catholic churches. Indeed, most Catholics take a pride in the weekly spectacle witnessed at their church, when rich and poor, saint and sinner, and in some places, white and black, come to kneel before the altar of God. They point out this marvel to their non-Catholic friends, and the wonderful sight is often the means of conversions to the Faith. But, when there is question of our schools and colleges, even good Catholics become confused and at times chagrined, if a colored person, to them the epitome of social inferiority, fulfils his bounden duty of seeking a Catholic education, the more securely to save his immortal soul. They are only too likely, when this event comes to pass, to be unduly influenced by false principles and criterions of admission and exclusion; by principles which justly govern our social connections, but not our religious relationships.

In the discussion of social standing in connection with our schools, I shall first consider the Catholic school in the abstract only; that is, without regard for attendant circumstances of time, place, people, their views about social equality and so on; then, I shall later treat of certain concrete cases which widely differ. First, then, are Catholic schools, considered in the abstract, essentially religious institutions established for the salvation of souls? They are. Those principles, therefore, which govern our religious relations with others, must determine whom we admit and whom we exclude from their classrooms. A Catholic school, merely as a Catholic

school, should accept its pupils because the latter are members of the Church who wish to save their souls. That is why it exists. Social standing should have absolutely nothing to do with admission or exclusion. One's position in society should not determine, nor should it follow from, nor should it be altered by, his admission to a Catholic school as such, nor by the reception of other students, white or black, at a Catholic school. It would be just as reasonable to say that two Catholics recognize each other as social equals because they receive the Bread of Life from the same hand and at the same communion rail. The Catholic church and school both have the same end, the salvation of souls, and many say that the school is of greater importance in achieving this end than the church. Both are necessary, and Catholics, white or black, considering the right order of things, should be admitted to the one as well as to the other. A Catholic school may, and often must, exclude a pupil because he or she is morally, intellectually, or physically disqualified; but never because of social standing.

In passing from the abstract to the practical discussion of concrete cases, the additional circumstance of social life must be considered as joined to the heretofore simple idea of a Catholic school. I shall consider successively several specific cases. First, as regards those particular schools which are located where the ideas and the feelings of the general public do not render the attendance of white and colored pupils at the same school impractical because of social inequality, the solution is clear. Where these conditions prevail, Catholic schools should admit both white and colored pupils who can fulfil usual requirements. These conditions do prevail in many parts of the country as may be seen from the existence of innumerable public and non-Catholic schools, which adopt the policy, and successfully carry it out in practice, of receiving both white and colored scholars. Yet, in spite of this fact, there are in these regions many Catholic schools which will not accept a Catholic colored pupil. There is no excuse for this unjust discrimination.

The question is different in those places where public feeling, regarding social inequality, is such as to render the mixing of the two races in Catholic schools impractical. These localities must be divided into two classes; those where the number of colored Catholics and sufficient money render it possible to supply separate schools for Catholic Negroes; and those where this cannot be done. In the first case, owing to the powerful force of the accidental circumstance of social inequality, it is justifiable and preferable to erect separate schools for the blacks, in which they can receive their just due, a Catholic education. In the second case, which obtains in countless regions in the United States, a Catholic colored person is lawfully entitled to admission to "white" Catholic schools, both for purposes of elementary and higher education. In these localities we cannot justly refuse a good Catholic Negro his right to a Catholic education, which is

the essential object of the school, nor lawfully bar him from his only means of attaining it, merely because of the accidental circumstance of social inferiority.

If, however, the enforced granting of this inherent right to a colored Catholic threatened serious consequences, for, example, the withdrawal of large numbers of white scholars, prudence would seem rather to dictate that the exclusion of the colored aspirant be tolerated, but not sanctioned, until such time when he can be received without detriment to the school as a whole. Meanwhile, every effort should be made to train the white children, and their parents, to the truly Catholic attitude under such circumstances.

Ignorance of the proper Catholic viewpoint on the part of students, parents, and often authorities, is, in great measure, the real reason why colored Catholics are barred from our schools. This ignorance may be done away with by instruction. Accordingly, the enlightening of our Catholic people must be the foundation stone of the part the Church is to play in the solution of the race problem. All in a position to do so have, therefore, a sacred duty of simple justice to perform in a matter of grave concern for our religious and national welfare. The education of Negroes in Catholic schools is as important to the solution of the race question as Catholic schools themselves are to the welfare of the Church.

In enlightening Catholics on this subject several points must be emphasized. First, the colored pupil admitted to the school must be morally fit, even as the white scholar. I know many colored children, also young men

and women, who if admitted to white schools would be a constant source of edification. Yet, by reason of our present policy, a black "St. Aloysius" often cannot be received for fear that he may contaminate others. Secondly, we must remember that, though there is a necessary but accidental social intermingling of the pupils, and a daily sharing of the same environment, yet each one can still choose his own companions and intimates; and *de facto* in every school this is done. Tact will be needed, especially when there is question of social functions held under the auspices of the school itself. But one thing is certain; we should not avoid these passing difficulties, which are secondary and accidental, by forbidding good Catholic Negroes that for which the school exists. Countless non-Catholic schools, without our supernatural motives, manage these secondary problems with little or no difficulty. Thirdly, the mere attendance at a school along with some respectable and moral colored children of our own Faith, purely for the sake of a Catholic education, even though it involves limited contact with Negroes, and a certain mingling of the two races in the "semi-family" life of the school, cannot of itself in any way harm, degrade, corrupt, or destroy the self respect of our white children. Rather from their youth they will daily have before their eyes a practical, living example of the universality of the Kingdom of Christ, and the grand spectacle of the Church militant approaching the sublime ideal of universal charity already attained by the Church triumphant, an example and a spectacle which will degrade and corrupt no one.

The Glow of Faith in Czechoslovakia

E. CHRISTICH

CATHOLICS, the real brand, are organizing with splendid impetus in Czechoslovakia. If law-breakers, scandalizers of society, attract undue attention and set the country in a ferment, it means, after all, that they are the exceptions. The mass of the good and loyal people, the normal Christians in the land, should not be overlooked, while we stare at the antics of the apostates. The revival of religious fervor deserves attention and might serve as a beacon to others. A fillip has been given perhaps to Catholic youth by the evil in view; for the recrudescence of societies to promote religious interests is quite phenomenal. Students of the higher and middle schools are concentrating and extending their unions. General communions are more frequent and better attended. The seceders and disturbers stand aghast at revelations of deep, ardent belief, and the determined stand for religious liberty. Angry crowds hinder the distribution of agnostic and anti-Papal leaflets at Catholic meetings, and the pioneers of "free-thought" who hoped to lead the people in new paths are in many places reduced to combating "the growing

dangers of clericalism." "We have gained nothing," they cry, "in chasing the Germans, as long as Czech professors bear the canopy over the head of a Prague Archbishop in an idolatrous procession." In Schonau 10,000 men participated in the Catholic day parade and several meetings were held at the same time. A similar success was achieved in Plau, where Mgr. Kordac, as eloquent as he is energetic, after a moving sermon in church, gave three separate addresses to groups of the crowd outside. His Grace was acclaimed with enthusiasm wherever he passed. His stirring pastoral had laid bare sometime previously the evils of the day: unlawful seizure of churches by the new sects; obstruction to Bishops in their duty of confirming the Faithful; unscrupulous propaganda by the Y. M. C. A.; anarchy that discredits the new republic; estrangement of the God-fearing Slovaks; corruption of youth by the cinema and shameless books; terrorism by a fanatic anti-religious minority over the truly religious, peace-loving, cultured Czech people.

To the great relief of the law-abiding community the Government has of late withdrawn its support from

some turbulent factors it had at first not only countenanced but encouraged. The ring-leaders of the schism, Zahradnik and Farsky, have been dismissed from the high posts they occupied. No government can long tolerate subversive elements, foes of accepted social codes and traditional moral standards such as the Czech innovators of a "National Church" have proved themselves to be. The revulsion of feeling is strengthened by the acts of the "reformers" who, in their efforts to discredit the clergy faithful to Rome, overleaped the mark. A campaign of calumny against all priests, not sparing, alas! the worthiest among the dead, was supposed to minimize their own shortcomings. "Not we alone," said the apostates, "but many others infringed the canons." And the fact that fallen priests maligned the priesthood, seeking to discredit the order to which they still affect to belong, filled impartial minds with disgust and dismay. These defamers were at one with atheists and blasphemers in attacking the Catholic clergy. Father Toman, in stern, telling words, exposed the disgraceful machination, and vindicated with righteous indignation, the memories of exemplary pastors thus basely calumniated. While money is forthcoming, however, to subsidize these wanton attacks they are bound to continue. The fiercest among the various sects into which the original schism is breaking up are financed by the Y. M. C. A. of America, ever intent on abetting rebels against Rome. But American Protestants of all shades of belief are overrunning the country. A Methodist who held meetings in a tent was at first successful in drawing crowds; for a tent, to the unsophisticated Czechs, meant a circus. There was a fight for the free seats until the real meaning of the performance became known, when the audience withdrew finding it too tame.

After the magnificent Catholic days of the Czechs the Germans of Czechoslovakia organized similar demonstrations of faith. Thousands assembled at Arnau and

Mariaschein to testify their allegiance to the Church. Bishop Gross, Senator Ledebour, Professor Mayr-Harting and the Deputy Dr. Feierfeil made notable speeches calling on all true men to work for the unity and solidarity of the Catholic body. Plans were drawn up for combination in sodalities, press activity, and all Catholic enterprise.

If it be repugnant to the Czechs to follow too closely in all things the ways of their German rivals, hitherto denounced as "masters and usurpers," they might well take example from that mighty Mother Russia, ever the source of their national inspiration, and learn how to safeguard their rights. The Bolsheviki have been forced to abandon the attempt to uproot religion from the soil of Russia. They no longer make war on priests or hinder religious observances. Prominent Bolsheviki now go to church for their marriage ceremonies and some have asked for Extreme Unction at the hour of death. In the Russian army, at the instance of the soldiers, Divine Service has been reinstated. A Russian professor, Dr. Berdajev, says: "The revolution brought freedom to at least one institution, our State Church. It arises fresh, undismayed, straining to a better future." One notes with satisfaction that the Russian women whose persistent militancy routed rabid Bolsheviki from the church doors have emulators among their Slav sisters of Czechoslovakia. In more than one instance the women successfully resisted a mob urged on by the "reformers" to seize the churches and expel the loyal parish priests. If Orthodoxy can make a gallant stand for the right to worship God will not Czech Catholics, men and women, crowd to the polls in defense of the true Faith? The separation of Church and State, which proved a fiasco in France, would be of graver import in Czechoslovakia. It would mean disruption and ruin to the new-born republic and Czechoslovakia surely deserves a better fate than that.

The New Menace of the Smith-Towner Bill

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

THERE is a line or two of verse to the effect that you may break, you may shatter the vase if you will, but the scent of the roses, and so on. The scent of Federal domination over the local schools still clings to the Smith-Towner bill. Not that Judge Towner has broken or shattered his bill. He has merely put another label on it. But a label is only a label. It neither makes nor destroys the contents of the container.

In kindly forwarding an authentic copy of the revised bill, Judge Towner ventures to hope that he has completely met every objection which I have urged in these pages, and elsewhere. Judge Towner possesses the virtue of hope in an heroic degree. He has answered not a single objection to the bill. In no essential respect does the bill with amendments differ from the measure intro-

duced in October, 1918, and I am somewhat surprised that Judge Towner should venture to hope that he has changed in any particular my judgment on this attempt to create a Federal dictator over schools within the States.

Several variations of minor importance are offered by Judge Towner, but the chief amendment is added to section 14, after line 23 (H. R. 7), and reads as follows:

Provided, that courses of study, plans and methods, for carrying out the purposes and provisions of this act within a State, shall be determined by the State and local educational authorities of said State, and this act shall not be construed to require uniformity of courses of study, plans and methods in the several States in order to secure the benefits herein provided.

By this amendment Judge Towner believes that he has provided once and for all against any danger of Federal

control of education. In the language of other critics, this amendment (1) makes absolutely impossible not only Federal control of, but even Federal interference with, any State school policy, and (2) by consequence leaves the respective States in full control of the schools within their jurisdiction.

Both claims are wholly without foundation. Section 14, lines 8 to 22, requires the chief educational authority to submit a report certifying that the State has "complied with the provisions of the act." Has human nature so changed that, with respect to educational policies and the manner in which they are to be applied, no difference of opinion is possible? The "provisions of the act" embrace, among others, a subject upon which there is a decided disagreement among American citizens, "the spirit and purpose of the American Government" (section 9). Judge Towner and myself, to take two examples at hand, differ essentially in our conceptions of that purpose. To judge by the numerous hyphenated bills which include his name, he believes, for instance, that it is compatible with "the spirit and purpose of the American Government" to subsidize education with Federal funds. I do not. He believes that the Federal Government ought to undertake the establishment of baby clinics, give instruction in the hygiene of maternity, and teach our school children the best ways of caring for the teeth. I emphatically reject that interpretation of the "spirit and purpose of the American Government." I repudiate that policy and all similar policies. I hold them to be unconstitutional and utterly without necessity or warrant. I believe that they tend to break down the self-reliance, initiative, and independence of the American people, and substitute therefor a governmental bureaucracy to care for the personal needs of a broken-spirited race, such as even bureaucratic-cursed Prussia would not have tolerated. If Judge Towner will recall the Senate debates of last month on the Sheppard-Towner maternity bill, he will remember the division of opinion on the propriety of the Federal Government assuming the functions of a national wet-nurse. He will also recall that while the opponents of his bill based their objections on sound constitutional grounds, its friends, rejecting the written grant of the Government's limited rights, our sole barrier against Federal encroachment, appealed from the Constitution of the United States to an alleged "common voice of the people." If the "common voice of the people," and not the Constitution of the United States, is now the writ of limitation upon the powers of Congress, it will also operate upon Federal judges, and it is time to burn the Constitution in the public square as an invasion upon the rights of the people. Yet this "common voice" is the sole justification for the numerous hyphenated bills which now besiege Congress, and which, if enacted, will create a bureaucratic government, subsidizing a host of petty officials, and eating out our substance by exorbitant taxes.

It is, then, arrant nonsense to assert that there can be

no possible divergence of opinion between the Federal Secretary of Education and the State's chief educational authority, on the question whether or not the State programs comply "with the provisions of the act." If there can be a difference at all, there can be a difference of opinion that is essential. As in section 9, so there is not a similar paragraph in the bill on which differences, sharp, living, and essential, may not arise. In these cases, which will undoubtedly arise, I ask which ruling, Federal or State, will prevail? Will Judge Towner contend that the Federal construction will naturally be adopted? If he does, and he must, how can his amendment prevent Federal control? If he asserts that the Federal official will invariably yield to the State official, then the plain terms of his bill contradict him.

For it is nowhere stated in the bill that any and all "courses of study, plans and methods for carrying out the purposes and provisions of this act within a State" shall be determined solely and exclusively by "the State and local educational authorities of said State," in such a manner that any and all "courses of study, plans and methods" presented by any State must be accepted by the Federal authorities. No such provision is found in the bill, or can be inserted. If the Federal Government grants money for any purpose, the Federal Government will control that purpose absolutely. As Senator Brandegee, of Connecticut, criticising the Sheppard-Towner maternity bill, said:

It is inevitable. They [the States] get their appropriations from Congress. Although the States might want to discontinue the service, they could not do it. Congress, if it appropriated or withheld the appropriations, would be master of the thing, and the master of the whole scheme would sit here in Washington.

That criticism describes exactly the machinery of the Smith-Towner bill.

If this bill passes, I do not believe there is any Senator who has so recently arrived here, or who has learned so little about the operations of governmental departments, that he can for a moment think that any State can have its way about the administration of this law, irrespective of the Government.

As long as the State participates with the Federal Government, it has got to fall in with the plan of the Federal Government. (*Congressional Record*, December 17, 1920, p. 481.)

Therefore, in case of disagreement between the Federal authority and the State authority, the Federal authority must and will prevail. The State "has got to fall in." Hence, no certificate presented by the State will be admitted until it is examined and passed by the Federal Secretary, as in harmony with his rulings. Messrs. Strayer, Towner, Keith, Bagley, Magill, and the rest may protest as they will the high improbability of any disagreement, and allege that in this crisis the Secretary would undoubtedly convene a Board of Conciliation, thereby reaching a friendly solution. To begin with, the bill makes no provision for the creation of this Board. Were it convened, it would have no more authority to enforce its conclusions than the city dog-catcher in New York. It might offer advice, and it would certainly

follow the political implications of the case, but advice is something that no man is obliged to follow. But Board or no Board, by the clear terms of the bill, the Federal Secretary remains supreme. For by section 14, lines 5 to 9:

... The Secretary of Education shall exercise no authority in relation thereto [State plans, etc.] *except as herein provided to insure that all funds apportioned to said State shall be used for the purposes for which they are appropriated by Congress.*

Does the authority herein given the Federal Secretary (1) make absolutely impossible, not only Federal control of, but even Federal interference with, local school policies, and (2) by consequence leave the respective States in full control of their schools?

The power "to insure" authorizes the right to examine, to review, to judge, and to enforce Federal decisions. If the bill *obliged* the Federal Secretary to accept any and all plans presented by the States, as meeting "the provisions of the act," and in unmistakable language withdrew from him all power "to insure," the two questions above might possibly be answered, with section 7 eliminated from the bill, in the affirmative. But since the Secretary, in his work of insuring, may reject as well as accept any State plans, both answers must be in the negative.

Nor have we yet reached the end of the Federal Secretary's power over the schools. Section 7, the whip of the bill, authorizing the annual appropriation of \$100,000,000, remains unchanged. Section 17, as of yore, requires an annual report from the State "showing the work done in said State in carrying out the provisions of this act." The Federal Secretary is not obliged to accept this report as satisfactory. On the contrary, *he is empowered* by section 15 to

withhold the apportionment or apportionments of any State for the next ensuing fiscal year *whenever he shall determine* that such apportionment or apportionments made to said State for the current fiscal year are not being expended in accordance with the provisions of the act. [He will also withhold if the State refuses to submit a report.]

Once more this section affirms the Federal Secretary's authority to regulate the educational work of the States. It directs him to ascertain by examination whether or not the State educational policy is in accord with the educational standards devised and enforced by a clique at Washington. It gives the final sanction to his ruling by directing him to withhold or allow the State's apportionment, as it rejects or accepts his rulings. This is absolute Federal power over the schools, and nothing else.

In other words, *the amendment means absolutely nothing*. A State official may fool himself into thinking that he and his associates alone will determine "courses of study, plans and methods for carrying out the provisions of the act within the State." When they reach Washington, they will discover that the Secretary alone is empowered to determine whether or not their nicely printed programs are "in accordance with the provisions of this act" (section 15). The last occasion on

which an objector fought the Federal Government with any notable success was Chancellorsville. Since that time, it has always been Appomattox and the old apple-tree.

Human nature has not changed. With the purest of intentions, men and women will continue to disagree on legal interpretations and educational policies. They do so disagree every day in every court and schoolhouse in the land. The Federal Government will continue serenely its settled policy of controlling everything that it subsidizes, and a great many things that it does not subsidize. The plan of the Smith-Towner bill is no exception. If this Federal Government begins to subsidize the schools, we shall soon be told what we must teach our children, and when, and how we must teach them, not precisely by the Federal Government, but by some political appointee or appointees at Washington. Thomas Jefferson, poor, ignorant fellow, thought that were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread. What will happen when a political clique is authorized to set educational standards for the whole country? In any case, we shall all grow wise enough to bewail the day on which we deliberately gave up our educational liberty.

I am grateful to Judge Towner for sending me so promptly a copy of his amendments. But they amend nothing. They make his case worse.

The Ku Klux Comedians

JOHN B. KENNEDY.

SHOULD you stroll in rural parts and be halted, while crossing a bosky dell, by the sight of a gentleman arrayed in an old-fashioned, four-square night gown, with a peaked pillow case covering his face and a painted rod in his hand—this gentleman emerging from a secluded hole in the ground known as a den—don't be alarmed. Also, abstain from characterizing the gentleman as silly. Appearances are against him, because a fancy for apparitions of this sort is usually marked in juvenile minds; but this gentleman is engaged in the none too leisurely occupation of saving the Republic.

He is a member of the Ku Klux Klan. Those Americans who had thought that, in 1871, the Federal troops had put an end to the Ku Klux Klan, will naturally be surprised that an organization condemned and dispersed by government, should return to flaunt its name before government.

But, apart from the name, the Klan is not now what it was to the sires and grandsires of the new men of the South. In the first days of reconstruction, bitter days indeed for the white people of the South, there was some excuse for mass-bullying and mass-cowardice; these things were generated by mass-fear. Ruined and riven, the South took panic at the thought of government by slaves. There was nothing sufficient to explain that

panic; but it was real and the Ku Klux Klan, silly though it was, in a measure relieved that panic.

Now we hear of the Klan returning to save the nation from all evil, all evil seemingly, but we trust, not really, being attributed to Catholic, Jews and Negroes who have the audacity to believe that they are entitled to earn their livelihoods and worship God according to the dictates of their consciences. We hear once more of the establishment of an invisible empire, of the sudden attachment of thousands and tens of thousands of citizens to the invisible empire. Of course, the elegant gentlemen who propose to establish and administer this invisible empire give no thought at all to the mutual exclusion of the terms invisible and empire. The Ku Klux Klan is neither an empire nor invisible. If it is an empire it cannot only be seen; it can be seen through.

A gentleman known as the Imperial Wizard is head of the new Ku Klux Klan and the only advertised member of this reputedly vast secret society. He might as well have had himself called the Imperial Contortionist, or the Supreme Somnambulist. Any of these titles would have been far happier than one implying that its holder is possessed of devils. From the declarations of the Supreme Wizard we are led to believe that all American institutions are in definite danger, and the impression is always conveyed that the principal danger is "foreign allegiance" of certain American citizens. Apparently, here enters the stale old calumny against Rome. We expected an Imperial Wizard to pull something far more interesting from his runcible hat. But this Imperial Wizard is not a conjurer; he is not even a plausible showman, for one New York editor has already publicly announced that "the Ku Klux Klan," whenever it makes a demonstration, manages to have a press agent and photographers on hand.

Being journalistically curious, the writer has made some superficial investigation of the Klan, and that is all that is needed to convince anybody of its spurious claims and charlatan makeup. From its headquarters in Atlanta a staff of skilled publicists are capitalizing the queerness and quaintness of the fad, and several learned statisticians are reckoning the sum total of initiation fees paid by the more or less intelligent persons who join the ranks. The publicity is, of course, all faked. To anybody familiar with modern publicity methods the emptiness and palpable staging of the pictures of the Ku Klux Klan are pitiful and it is only the newness of the phenomenon that makes it at all acceptable to editors weary of all manner of publicity "tricks," even clever publicity tricks. Without their nightgowns the Ku Klux knights would not be worth an obscure inch on the sport page.

As far as their patriotic activity weighs in the news-scale, it is conceivable that there is less news interest in a group of Knights of Pythias bound for a clam bake than in a group of Ku Klux Knights bound for a "nigger bake"; but there is no question of the relative patriotic merit of the two functions. So long as the Klansmen

charge wildly around at night in narrow-tired motors and stage third-rate melodrama scenes in out-of-the way woods they will have the news-interest that attaches to all freaks. It is when the learned Imperial Wizard calls in his press-agents and speaks *ex cathedra* of politics and religion that the fate of the Klan as a publicity engine hangs in the balance.

The Ku Klux Klan pretends to success in what it terms a Northern invasion. A certain Jay W. Forrest, guilelessly engaged in taking in vain the name of the Father of his Country, has demonstrated in recent months that there are many hundreds of odd dollars itching in the pockets of persons whose favorite mental hobby is religious prejudice. Mr. Forrest recently arose at a meeting in New York and displayed a small cake of soap stamped with the name and shield of the Knights of Columbus. He forcefully asserted that the K. of C. employed soap as propaganda among non-Catholics. The Knights of Columbus have far more acumen than to question so ostentatiously the hygiene of those who do not agree with them in religion. The soap in question, which Mr. Forrest probably secured from somebody who had received it as a gift from the Knights, was plainly marked so that it could not possibly be offered for sale to men of the service by the representatives of an organization unfortunately notorious for business as differentiated from philanthropic practice.

The Ku Klux Klan, with its system of initiation fees, is probably planning to give Mr. Forrest stiff competition. There is a promising, if sporadic, field for financial cultivation in the anti-Catholic regions, which are not by any means confined to the South. It is this field that the Ku Klux Klan plan to plant and harvest.

Possibly there are political reasons for the revival of the Klan. The Negro vote is supposedly tied up with Republican fortunes, and Republican fortunes, just now, are very much in the ascendant. But if this political reason is the sole reason for the existence of the Klan, as it is certainly the most charitable reason, what happens to their boast of Americanism? Precisely what happens to every ill-founded boast. It is punctured by the first prick of logic.

There may be dangers threatening the harmonious life of the Republic. Unquestionably there are dangers. And not the least danger is the maliciously foolish attempt to stir up religious antagonism. But the real reason for the attempt to revive the Ku Klux Klan is quite obvious. The Knights of Columbus, by their disinterested and highly successful reconstruction work are the objects of vindictive envy, and this envy is just becoming articulate, it may grow vociferous. Our hope that it will never become openly maleficent reposes in the belief that the body of Americans are sane enough to see that there is such a thing as genuine charity performed without ulterior motives—such charity as the Knights of Columbus have found it in their power to perform for God and country.

Catholics cannot permit the boasts and veiled taunts

of the Ku Klux Klan press agents to appear without rebuke. Unchallenged appearance inspires a bold contempt for the respect that the K. of C. have earned for the Catholic name. Ridicule is a severe weapon, a sharp weapon. But it is not always sufficient. We must protest whenever and wherever we find this movement encouraged or tolerated, because it is un-American quite as much as it is anti-Catholic.

Don Quixote fought windmills; but he at least held the windmill to be the repository of loosened devils and he at least held himself an armored exorcist. The Knights of the Ku Klux Klan fight something less resistant, they fight the wind, which is an emblem of wildness. It is our concern to see that in their foolish and futile struggle they do not create an ill wind.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six hundred words

Benjamin Franklin Misquoted

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I see that Benjamin Franklin is misquoted now, just as he was by the Government itself when it started the issuing of war-saving stamps. Only a superficial observer could have said that a penny saved is a penny earned. The great apostle of thrift knew from his own experience that "a penny saved is two pence gained." People would be much more thrifty if they fully realized that when they spend a dollar they put themselves where they will have to earn two dollars or very much more in order to get even again. You have to live while you are working and it costs money to live. Franklin tried to teach the American people that saving is just about twice as important as earning but his wisdom was nullified by a foolish saying which comes easily off the tongue and therefore lives on and on.

New York.

J. HOWARD COWPERTHWAIT.

Love for Ireland

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The recommendation of Ethna Carberry's poetry in a recent AMERICA pleased me, but an inference in the introductory paragraph of the appreciation calls for protest. Holding up "Luke Delmege," the child of the late Canon Sheehan's brain, as typical of Irish youth, the writer represents the young cleric as unwilling "to help in bettering conditions that he found so narrow and confining," and adds, that "most of Luke's compatriots who have accomplished things in the eyes of the world, have done so outside of Ireland." He hints that the Irish, generally speaking, are a selfish people, prepared to sacrifice their love of "Dark Rosaleen" for personal gain, and rejoices at finding in Ethna Carberry one who "cared more for Ireland than for fame." A most cursory knowledge of Ireland's history and Ireland's literature shows that unselfish attachment to Ireland, similar to Ethna Carberry's love and sacrifice, far from being the exception, is quite the general thing with the Irish people.

New Madrid, Mo.

SARSFIELD P. SULLIVAN.

Colored Children in Catholic Schools

To the Editor of AMERICA:

This question, when discussed, is generally treated as a solution for the other fellow, or for some good zealous religious who sees things from a spiritual viewpoint. But we must be practical, and the one way to be practical, is to try and apply the solution to ourselves. If white and colored children go to the same Catholic schools, they would naturally participate in all

studies, entertainments and games, and surely if they go to day-school together, it would be proper for them to go to boarding-school together. With such affiliations Christian charity would break down all social barriers.

If white girls and colored girls attend Catholic convents and commingle as friends, surely the brothers of the colored girls would naturally be received as friends of the white girls, and, I dare say, the white girls would have no hesitancy in receiving their company and attention. The same might be applied to boys in Catholic colleges and schools. What would be the natural result? Needless to say inter-marriage. What then? The first real quarrel would leave a sting in the heart of one of the contracting parties that he or she would carry to the grave. There was a young colored man who worked for me, who decided to marry, and did marry, one of his race, a very light, almost white girl. He was very dark. They lived together for four years, having occasionally little family disputes. One evening he remonstrated about something or other and she called him a black nigger. She used the term that she felt might cut him deepest. The result? They have separated, he has obtained a divorce, and plans to marry again.

Suppose that the white and colored persons live happily and have children, with whom will their children associate? They will be neither white nor black. If a general fusion were to take place overnight, I am not prepared to say what would be the result, but under the present situation what pandemonium, disaster, agony and heartaches this fusion of the white and colored races would bring. Would any of the zealous white writers of the articles appearing in AMERICA like to be invited home to a marriage of his sister, niece or grandniece to some refined Catholic black gentleman, or receive a bridal picture, in the sanctum of his monastery or college, of his dear sister, niece, or grandniece standing with a black gentleman as her husband? Do you think for one moment that the recipient, in a spirit of exultation, would take this picture and show it to his friends?

The spiritual side is quite another side. No true Catholic believes that our colored brethren in Christ should be barred from our Catholic churches, but certain places should be reserved for them, not necessarily the back of the church, but in the church. One of the most pleasant remembrances I have of the worshipping of the white and colored people together in our church was the occasion when my little five-year-old daughter received Holy Communion after Mass, alone, except for an old grey-haired colored man. We of the South have been most neglectful of our sacred duty of educating our colored brethren, but it seems now to have been a blessing in disguise, since our only means of education would have been a system of public schools, and as we are now reaping the fruits of our godless schools, what might not we now be suffering from this education?

Foster, La.

C. P. B.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Kindly allow me space to say that in AMERICA of January 15, "J. W." after quoting my words correctly in the third line from the beginning of his letter, misquotes them in the third line from the end, thereby making me responsible for several things I did not say. He also missed the point and misconstrued my meaning, by attributing to me this "confession" (?), which I did not make: "Conditions are equally bad at the North." My contention was that in the absence of statistics to show the relative danger from the commingling of the sexes at a certain age, I could not imagine how it could be worse between blacks and whites in the South than investigations had shown it to be among whites, in certain high schools, in the North. With this, I leave further discussion of the Negro problem to the principals in the controversy, especially to those "entitled to write the glorious initials, S.J." after their names.

White Bear Lake, Minn.

WM. F. MARKOE.

A M E R I C A

A · CATHOLIC · REVIEW · OF · THE · WEEK

SATURDAY, JANUARY 29, 1921

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 Europe, \$5.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Cheques for the American Committee for Relief in Ireland may be sent to the treasurer, J. J. Pulleyn, Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank, 51 Chambers St., New York, N. Y.

The Fordham University "Drive"

FOR the first time in its seventy-nine years of existence, Fordham University is appealing to the country for financial assistance. Throughout that long period it has labored unceasingly and uninterruptedly, with courage undaunted and ideals undimmed, in the interests of the community, asking favors of none, extending courtesy to all, content to be allowed to work for God and Church and State, willing to be judged by results. In all that long stretch of more than three-quarters of a century, as its President recently remarked, it has never debarred a student from its halls because he could not pay tuition. Not the making of money, but the making of men, has been its purpose; not wealth nor worldly success nor fame, nor even gratitude, has been the object of its quest, but the training of its sons along the lines of true nobility. It has looked for no other reward but the growing list of worthy representatives in both private and public walks of life, who under its fostering care have learned to be sober and pure, strong and gentle, honorable, honest, unfaltering to the trusts given them by God and man.

The consequence has been that, although Fordham is still struggling for the means of subsistence, many parts of our country are richer for its graduates, and especially in the possession of the sterling manhood that has been the heritage conferred on its sons. Fordham has opened the way to affluence to others, although it cared for no share in their fortune; it has made possible for others the acquisition of wealth, it has remained itself in poverty. Nor has it desired anything else. All that it has ever desired has been opportunity for service, and opportunity for service is the full content of its desire today.

Somehow or other, by sacrifice and self-denial, its faculty has been able to meet the demands of the past, it can do so no longer. For whereas in the pioneer days tens knocked at her doors for admittance, thousands are

knocking today, and because classrooms and other equipment are lacking, applicants are being turned away by hundreds. There never was a time, perhaps, when the country had such need as at present of men of strong principle, of stern self-discipline, of high ideals, men who have the knowledge and the courage to see and dare the right, men of the type Fordham aims at forming. Such men are the best hostage we can give to fortune, the best guarantee of continued prosperity and peace. It is young men such as these who are asking that it be made possible for them to obtain higher education with all that it implies for happiness and holiness, for, although in the technical sense, it is the University that is making the appeal, it is doing so, not for itself but for them, not in its own name but in theirs, nor for its own advantage but simply that it may be put in a position to extend to a greater number the advantages of college training. It would be difficult to find an appeal more worthy of a generous response. Fordham University must be helped to fulfil its mission of unselfish service.

For Catholic Employers

A GREAT Eastern manufactory has resumed operations after a vacation of one month on a basis of three working days per week. In November, 1920, this concern cut wages ten per cent, and beginning with February, another cut of twenty-five per cent will be made. The company announces that these changes are necessary to meet the general "readjustment of prices" throughout the country. This claim may be true, but it will bring the worker near starvation. In October, 1920, operating on a forty-four hour per week basis, the worker's weekly wages were, let us say, \$33.00. The first ten per cent cut brought him to \$29.70. Now the three day per week basis reduces him to \$16.20, and the new twenty-five per cent cut brings his weekly wages from \$33.00 in October, 1920, to \$12.15 in February, 1921. This worker thus experiences a reduction of about sixty per cent in three months. This kind of "readjustment" may be somewhat extreme, but it is probably more common than is indicated by the usual labor reports.

How will this worker make ends meet? Employed on a three day basis, he must eat and clothe himself and pay rent on a seven day basis. Not even the optimistic Judge Gary who sees nothing ahead but sunshine and clear sailing can argue that this "period of readjustment" reduces the worker's expenses in an approximately safe proportion to the reduction of his income. Since June, 1920, the cost of living, taking the generous estimate furnished by the Department of Labor, has dropped about eight per cent. Clothing is somewhat cheaper, as are also several common articles of food. But rents remain at about the same high level, except in some of the smaller communities. The worker cannot economize in rent. He can eat less and wear rags, but if he cannot pay the rent, out he goes.

As is usual in every period of "readjustment," it is the poor man who must bear the heavier burden. With their reserve forces the rich can tide over the hard times, with scarcely the retrenchment of an exotic luxury. Not so the worker. With difficulty has he been able to meet the current expenses of his pinched life, much less make any adequate provision for the future. Whatever market conditions may seem to demand, Catholic employers of labor have a duty in this period of readjustment which they cannot in conscience shirk. It may be pleasant to make money. But it will not be pleasant to meet at the bar of God on the great Judgment Day the wives who have slaved and toiled and the little children who have gone cold and hungry in order that the barons of finance might feast sumptuously, clad in purple and fine linen.

A Dying Race

"**O**FTENTIMES," writes the superioress of an Austrian convent, "my heart bleeds when I behold the strength of the good Sisters failing, or see them sinking prematurely to the grave under the weight of their hardships." Not merely is there question of a lack of food, but during all the long years since the first outbreak of the war these nuns have not had the means to purchase one single article of clothing and footwear, or to buy the necessary wool or cloth. All their garments are worn threadbare, and such as could no longer be repaired have never been replaced in the last seven years. This is not an isolated instance. It represents a condition that is common enough throughout the land. To purchase new articles of clothing for the Sisters, at the present prices, is unthinkable, unless help comes to them from abroad. Poverty has reached such a height that the same garments must often be worn in turn by the different members of religious communities. Some must helplessly wait, while others go about the necessary work. Nowhere can they hope to receive the normal quantity or quality of food.

Nuns and priests are the greatest sufferers, and it is these in particular whom the Cardinal Archbishop of Vienna is at present seeking to aid with the sums that are sent to him, although his assistance is not limited to them by any means. Catholics who give in charity should therefore bestow their money through Catholic channels. It is for this reason that we have opened our Austrian Fund. But there is even a higher purpose to be borne in mind. The money that is at present being gathered through outside agencies does not reach the Catholic institutions. It is bestowed in entirely different ways against which we do not mean to offer an objection. But the fact is that if Catholics fail to support their distinctive Catholic charities in Austria the consequence will be that all our Catholic institutions, that have been built and continued through these many years with such great sacrifices, must inevitably be closed.

Can American Catholics then be thoughtless enough to offer large donations through other channels and neglect the most crying needs of their own Church? It is high time that this matter should be given serious consideration. It does not profit us that gifts are readily sent to our own relief fund, which AMERICA has established to aid in this work; but it is of the utmost importance for the Church and the salvation of souls, no less than for the temporal welfare of poor, stricken Austria that this Catholic charity should be remembered.

It is imperative that means should be supplied to the Cardinal Archbishop of Vienna for the work which he is carrying on in a scientific and Christian manner. Amid the wreck and ruin of a once prosperous country there stands no more powerful and determined protector of civilization than the Catholic Church. She alone can most effectively stay the march of Bolshevism that seemingly threatens Austria, and in fact the entire world. What will become of this hapless land if her Catholic institutions are to be closed because American Catholics are now bestowing their bounties, generously indeed, but not according to Christian wisdom?

Reunion in New York

THE reunion of Christ's children, so that there may be but one flock and one shepherd, is a hope dear to every Catholic heart. The basis of reunion every Catholic knows. There will be no paltering with heresy, for heresy is treason to the truth, delivered once for all by Christ Jesus. There may, possibly, be concessions in minor matters. But the man who sees the essential truth presented by Christ's mystical body, is the last to haggle over non-essentials. He is so filled with gratitude for his delivery from the prison of death that he is willing to forget the non-essentials which had grieved his captive mind.

In the work of reunion, the Protestant Episcopal Church has borne a part that is prominent, even if unpromising. It may seem unkind to remark that some of the schemes presented by its clergymen exhibit a slowness of comprehension that is astonishing. Surely, it should be plain by this time that the terms of reunion will be dictated by the Bishop of Rome. But apart from this fundamental fact, there are other considerations which should indicate to the Protestant Episcopal Church that it presents no definite creed which might be considered, even academically, as a possible basis of reunion. What does this Church believe? Who can answer for the Protestant Episcopal Church, since some of its authorized representatives flout as nonsense what other representatives, equally authorized, hold as essential to Christianity?

New York probably exhibits the extremest form of that "comprehensiveness" which to earnest seekers must seem a scandalous indifference to the truth. Certain clergymen of this Protestant Church profess to say Mass

daily. Certain others regard this act as mummery at best, and idolatry in reality. The Protestant Episcopal Church does not decide whether or not what remains on the altar is the Body of Christ, to be adored even as He is adored at the right hand of His Father, or merely a piece of bread. You may believe what you wish to believe, and adore or tear down, bless or curse, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, whatever your decision, will make no protest. Dr. Karl Reiland, rector of St. George's Church, addressing a group of Lutheran clergymen, abandons apostolic succession. The Bishop "is merely an interesting decoration," he said. "We must have someone to go around and say grace at banquets." He ended by urging his hearers not to seek reordination in his church, since their own ordination was quite as good. Dr. Grant, rector of the Church of the Ascension, well known for his approval some years ago of what the *New York Sun* termed "Broadway highball marriages," goes beyond the bounds set by Dr. Reiland. He wishes the Apostles Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Athanasian Creed to be taken from their present place in the "Prayer Book" and relegated to a museum-like appendix. As for the Apostles Creed, "no mature and educated man today can assent to it without stultifying reservations."

These gentlemen still hold office as teachers in the Protestant Episcopal Church, although one denies the Apostles Creed and the other the prescription by Divine institution, of Holy Orders. They will doubtless continue to hold their respective offices. Do they speak for their church? If not, who are its accredited spokesmen? That is a question which the Protestant Episcopal Church, boasting its comprehensiveness as though indifference to revealed truth were a mark of Christ's Church, will not dare answer. But there can be no reunion between the Catholic Church, the Divinely appointed guardian of revelation, and an organization which freely permits its clergy to scout the most sacred tenets of Christianity.

The "Amended" Smith-Towner Bill

NO mistake should be made. A mistake at this time would be fatal. Amendments have been offered by Mr. Towner, but in every essential respect, the Smith-Towner bill is the same un-American, despotic measure introduced in October, 1918.

The section authorizing an annual appropriation of \$100,000,000, to begin with, remains unchanged. What the Federal Government subsidizes the Federal Government controls. There is no escape from that conclusion. Permit the Federal Government, acting through a political appointee, to distribute year by year hundreds of millions of dollars, and complete Federal control of education in this country, including the private as well as the public schools within the States, is only a matter of time. If the Smith-Towner bill is adopted, the prophecy of Senator Thomas of Colorado, discerning a political officer

ruling schools of whatever grade and purpose throughout the States, will see a speedy fulfillment.

Nor have the sections which, in practice, give a political appointee power to control local school programs and policies, been changed in any essential detail. In the amended bill, as in the original version, the States are required, as an indispensable preliminary, to submit a report on school conditions and school programs, which certifies that they have complied with all the requirements of the act. This report embraces the "provisions" of the act; that is, every detail of the local school economy, from the subjects of instruction, including instruction in the duties of American citizenship, to the plans for the preparation of teachers. It is nowhere stated in the amended bill that in case of disagreement between the educational authorities of any State and the political appointee designated as Federal Secretary of Education, the plans submitted by the State *must be accepted*. On the contrary, final power to accept or to reject is vested solely in the Federal authority. He is not obliged to approve the State program. If he judges that the State has not complied with the requirements of the Federal act, he will withhold approval, the State meanwhile paying its quota of the Federal educational tax. Plainly and without qualification, in the very first stage of Federal "cooperation," the Smith-Towner bill invests the Federal Secretary with a dictatorship over the local schools.

Furthermore, every State is obliged to file an annual report with the Federal Secretary, stating in what manner the Federal appropriation has been used. If on inspecting this report, the Federal Secretary rules that the State, because of its programs, or its methods of teaching, or for any reason deemed by himself competent in the premises, has not reached the educational standards set by a bureaucratic Department at Washington, he will direct the Secretary of the Treasury to withhold all payments until the State's educational work has been remodeled in accordance with Federal directions.

The Smith-Towner bill as amended is emphatically the old Smith-Towner bill of October, 1918. For the local schools it creates a Federal dictator, and empowers him to enforce his decisions through his control of the Federal millions. It authorizes a centralized governmental usurpation of a great social force, such as even bureaucratic France under Napoleon, and Prussia, dominated by Bismarck, were spared. It is the complete repudiation of hallowed, well-tried American principles, and the most pernicious enemy to democracy that ever won a hearing from time-serving politicians. It is a proposal that should call forth the instant and unsparing condemnation of every man who from his heart abhors the principle, dear to the hearts of tyrants and bureaucrats, but essential to the Smith-Towner bill, that the people are unable to devise their own educational policies, and must accept whatever plans and programs may be permitted them, or imposed upon them, by a governmental director of education.

Literature

TWO BOOKS ON LINCOLN

THE most pathetic picture in American history is Nancy Hanks, "who gave us Lincoln and never knew." "Her life and face," writes Lamon, "were equally sad," and it is related that she "habitually wore the woful expression which afterward distinguished the countenance of her son." Lincoln's memories of this sweet and gentle woman were as the memories of some angelic visitor. He was but ten years old when she died, worn out not by the harrowing count of years, but by the daily hardships of a rude frontier. Tradition records that on her death-bed she called the boy to her side. "I am going away from you, Abraham," she said, "and I shall not return. I know you will be a good boy, and that you will be kind to Sarah and your father. I want you to live as I have taught you to live, and love your Heavenly Father." Literally true or only an affectionate tribute, the tradition expresses the lessons which this pioneer mother had tried to impress on the heart of her boy.

But pure though she was as ice and chaste as snow, scandal has not spared her name. Some of this scandal Lincoln knew. He believed that his mother's mother had sinned. It is more than probable that she had. Yet let us judge not her, but our own sins. While we know that over the cradle of the little Nancy no father leaned with pride and reverence, we do not know what hunger for affection in her loneliness, the craving of untaught and inexperienced years, had made the young mother love not wisely but too well. She sinned, but what evidence is available allows my preference to believe that she was not evil. Did Lincoln fear that she too of whom he had said in deep emotion, "God bless my mother! All that I am or hope to be, I owe to her," had once exchanged the dignity and sweetness of her womanly purity for an unhallowed love? The fear haunted him. It would not be exorcised, it could not be admitted. At one time he caused the records of Hardin County, Kentucky, to be searched for the marriage-license of Thomas Lincoln and Nancy Hanks. The search was unsuccessful, and Lincoln lived on, and died, without knowing that the license had been registered in a neighboring county.

God's servant, Sorrow, gave us Lincoln. He brooded on the sufferings of his mother who bore him on a bitter morning in the poor rented cabin on the Forks of Nolan's Creek. Never had she lived in a home that she could call her own. His childhood and early life were, as he himself said, "the simple annals of the poor." He hungered and thirsted for knowledge, and he had not a year's schooling in his life. His great soul sought God and the things of the spirit, only to be beaten back by the degrading superstition and the blasphemies of a corrupted Calvinism. Anne Rutledge, "wedded" to him "not through union but by separation" was taken from him as a flower that is gathered. Often he tramped out into the night to watch by her grave; his grief bore him near the dark blur of insanity. One night as the wind out of the North swept the chill rain over the prairie, the stricken man, head bowed in his hands and the tears trickling through his rough and knotted fingers, moaned to one who sought to console him: "I cannot forget her, I cannot! The thought of the rain and the snow on her grave fills me with indescribable grief." He never forgot her. Sorrow walked with Lincoln. "I have grown used to disappointment," he wrote simply, some thirty years later. Under this shadow grew his sympathy for all who suffered, his tenderness and his strength, his marvelous patience, his matchless soul that would work with charity for all and malice toward none. Such was the background of his life; and Abraham Lincoln lived and died with an abiding love for his mother, and a torturing doubt of his paternity.

In "The Paternity of Abraham Lincoln" (Doran) by Dr.

William E. Barton, the student of Lincoln finds a book that was much needed. Gossip that was born of evil minds, rehearsed in tap-rooms and hinted at in stray pages of the standard works, has at last been subjected, unpleasant as the task was in some details, to merciless analysis. To no fewer than eight men, including John Marshall and John C. Calhoun, has the paternity of Lincoln been attributed. The result of Dr. Barton's labors is a masterly essay which should forever set at rest questions hitherto debated. The book is full of curious information, much of it hitherto generally inaccessible, on the early life of Lincoln and his environment. Briefly, Dr. Barton's conclusions are three. First, Nancy Hanks was a pure maiden and a chaste wife. Second, the truth as to her paternity cannot yet be definitely ascertained. Third, the fact that Abraham Lincoln was born of Thomas Lincoln and of Nancy Hanks Lincoln, his wedded and lawful wife, is as certain as any fact in history. "The Paternity of Abraham Lincoln" merits the praise that can be given few books: it speaks, in my judgment, the last word on the subject.

I am sorry I cannot welcome with equal pleasure the second of the recent Lincoln books, Dr. J. W. Hill's "Abraham Lincoln: Man of God." (Putnam.) "What is new in it is not true," is a criticism attributed to Talleyrand, "and what is true is not new." Around the question of Lincoln's religion many a sentimental conflict has been waged; sometimes, I think, by well-meaning men and women whose concept of Christian virtue involves a strain of unreality and softness utterly foreign to Lincoln's character. The truth is that Lincoln was not a Christian, for he was never baptized. Religion was a living thing in his community and public worship almost a community exercise, yet he never affiliated with any church. Much of the religious teaching which the young Lincoln heard simply shocked and disgusted him. It was grotesque, it was inhuman or too human, and some of its manifestations were not precisely the fine flower of delicacy and propriety which Lincoln himself did not then have but thought he should find, in religion. Camp-meetings, as the historian knows, were not invariably sanctuaries. Lincoln could not believe that Almighty God had created any human beings, much less the majority of the human race, with the precise purpose of burning them to His glory throughout eternity. It is an opinion not elsewhere presented, so far as I know, but one which will bear examination, that this blasphemy, presented as the teaching of Jesus Christ, threw Lincoln into a kind of fatalism and effectively barred him from what was preached to him as Christianity. The Catholic doctrine on this subject I do not think he ever heard. Hence in his early days, his penetrating speculative mind entered channels charted by the current religious teaching of the day, as lighted on either side by the baleful fires of Hell. But neither then nor at any time was Lincoln an "infidel."

Nor was he an irreligious man. While his attendance at public worship was always "intermittent," he listened to more than one Protestant clergyman attentively and, as he said, with profit. He was friendly to all ministers of religion, and on several occasions gladly cut through the fanatical Stanton's red tape to help the Sisters in their works of mercy with the armies and in the hospitals. Ward Lamon wrote of him: "He was not a Christian in the orthodox sense of the term, yet he was as conscientiously religious as any man." I do not know a more accurate description of Lincoln's religious life. But in the last five years of his career Lincoln's religious concepts became deeper and truer. He began to realize and to acknowledge the existence of Almighty God, the need of humble submission to His fatherly will, and the place of prayer in life. He searched the pages of Holy Writ for light and guidance; he asked in

prayer that he might be strengthened to bear his heart-crushing burdens faithfully to the end; he bade the people look to God alone for help. I know that in official proclamations references to Almighty God may be mere concessions to popular opinion, but there is no banal formality in the unstudied words which he spoke haltingly to his old Springfield friends and neighbors who had gathered in the rain to say good-by as he left for Washington. They came from his heart:

No one not in my situation, can appreciate my feelings of sadness at this parting. To this place, and to the kindness of you people, I owe everything. Here I have lived a quarter of a century, and have passed from a young to an old man. Here my children have been born and one is buried. I now leave, not knowing when or whether I may ever return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being who ever attended him, I cannot succeed. With that assistance I cannot fail. Trusting in Him who can go with me, and remain with you, and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well. To His care commending you, as I hope in your prayers you will commend me, I bid you an affectionate farewell.

A mature man who in the midst of weighty official cares, gets down on his knees to implore God's help in simple childlike prayers, is no infidel, and President Lincoln did that. Significant too of his wider spiritual horizon are his solemn vow to God touching the Emancipation Proclamation and his unfeigned gratitude, very noticeable in his last years, to people who said they prayed for him.

History written mainly "for edification" has perpetuated many a harmful untruth. Of course, Dr. Hill's good faith is beyond question, but an uncritical attitude disqualifies the historian. That in the Providence of God, Abraham Lincoln was raised up for a mighty work to which he was ever faithful, is plain. But to represent Abraham Lincoln as throughout his life a man of interior prayer and a keen appraiser of spiritual values, is, I fear, to falsify the record.

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

SNOW-CLAD PINES

No pine this morn but hath an alb of snow
On looms of storm fresh-woven overnight;
Each sapling bows a surpliced acolyte,
And mitered abbots are enrobed to go
Unto the altar of the Lord; soft blow
The mists like perfumed incense curling light
Along cloud-coffered vaults of aerial hight;
The woods have turned to God in dawn's gray glow.

I too will worship with my brother trees
Beneath space-pillared domes of woodland shrine;
For they with stately liturgy adore
Our common Father. And so, constrained by these
Grave priests in ermine robes, shall prayer of mine
Take wing with theirs and unto God upsoar.

M. J. RIORDAN.

REVIEWS

A Modern Book of Criticism. Edited with an introduction by LUDWIG LEWISOHN. New York: Boni & Liveright.

Why is it that so much modern literary criticism is unintelligible? Why is it that so many contradictory views are hotly defended on the merits of today's writers and of those of times past? Why is it that novels, dramas, poems and essays which the disinterested professional critic joins with the evidently interested publisher in heralding as works of artistic genius are either damned with faint praise by the Catholic reviewer or denounced as a menace to literary taste no less than to Christian morality? A discerning study of "A Modern Book of Criticisms" will enable the reader to work out for himself the answers to these questions.

In his introduction Mr. Lewisohn tells us, among other things: "A group of critics, young men or men who do not grow old, are at work upon the creation of a civilized cultural atmosphere in America. Their circle of readers is still small and their influence limited." He compares them to "a group of shivering young Davids," and proposes in his anthology "to furnish them with stones for their slings." With this aim in mind he has gathered together

modern critical passages that will give the liberal critics of America . . . documentary evidence of three facts of the first importance. Firstly, that their battle was fought and won in France thirty years ago; secondly, that in Germany, where the heritage of Goethe's supreme vision made the battle needless, a complete philosophical basis for the new criticism has been provided; thirdly, and more obviously, that the chief creative minds of England and Ireland are fighting with them.

Subjectivism, it will be remembered, was the accepted philosophy of the last century, and is still in honor outside Catholic circles of thought. Knowledge was held to be purely subjective. Ideas do not represent or mirror objects as they are in themselves; they merely make known to us the way in which we are affected by them according to our dispositions. And since we ourselves change with the changing times, anything or everything that was true in our boyhood may be false in our youth. So truth is relative, not absolute. In such a system there can, of course, be no question of an unchanging norm of truth, external to the mind or thinking subject.

From philosophy to art the step was easy and soon taken, and art-criticism was quick to assimilate the ideas of the prevailing philosophy, to speak its language and reduce to practice its subversive teachings. So we are not surprised to hear Anatole France tell us: "There is no such thing as objective criticism any more than there is objective art. . . . Esthetics is founded on nothing solid, it is a castle in the air. Men have tried to prop it upon ethics. But there is no ethics." Influenced by the same attitude, Jules Lemaitre, reaches the conclusion: "One judges that to be good which one loves. There is the whole matter."

Given subjectivism there can, it is clear, be no such thing as abiding and immutable laws of morality. God's existence is at best doubtful; and since He is the supreme legislator, in the moral as well as in the physical order, if the existence of the legislator is uncertain, what binding force can his laws exact?

The state of mind may possibly explain the insistence of many of the critics that art and morality are not and need not be interwoven. "I need no hierarchical moral world for my dwelling place," Mr. Lewisohn remarks, "because I desire neither to judge nor to condemn. Fixed standards are useless to him whose central passion is to have men free." George Moore, in an extract from "Confessions of a Young Man," insinuates pretty plainly what he does not care to say frankly, Bernard Shaw's mind is shown clearly enough in his eulogy of Ibsen, and W. L. George becomes somewhat hysterical at the thought that literary writers are not allowed to be sincere. The meaning he attaches to "sincerity" is evident from his complaint that "the assassins of sincerity are the publisher and the policeman." And Arnold Bennett triumphantly cries out that Swinburne "has simply knocked to pieces the theory that great art is inseparable from the Ten Commandments."

It is hard to believe that the majority of literary critics today are guided by the principles—or the absence of principles—championed in Mr. Lewisohn's anthology. But read the critiques of poetry and prose that appear from month to month in many of our leading magazines or help to fill the literary supplement of the Sunday papers, and reconcile them, if you can, with fixed authoritative objective standards of judgment.

J. A. C.

A Handbook of Patrology. By The Rev. J. Tixeront, D.D. St. Louis: Herder, \$2.50.

In the history of dogma and the field of patristic literature, the name of Father Tixeront is an "open sesame" to the good will and sympathy of his readers. His work is sealed with the unmistakable stamp of research, scholarship, accuracy and soundness. A mere glance at the volume before us gives immediate evidence of the breadth of his reading and the trustworthiness of his conclusions. The student who takes up the handbook will immediately feel that he has a safe and learned guide, while even the more advanced scholar, can gather many an item of patristic lore, and visualize more clearly and definitely the whole course of that wonderful stream of eloquence and learning which for so many centuries gave life and vigor to the Church of God.

In well-defined sections, the learned author studies the apostolic Fathers, Clement, Ignatius, Hermas, Papias; the apologists of the second century, Aristides of Athens, Tatian, Athenagoras, Hermias, Minucius Felix. He adds to these a fascinating study of the heretical and apocryphal literature of the same age, passing in rapid review the apocryphal gospels, epistles, apocalypses and other works of the same extravagant character. Then follow the opponents of heresy in the second century, Hegesippus, Irenaeus and the anti-Montanistic writers, followed in turn by the Oriental writers of the following age, while the section is closed by a review of the western writers of the third century such as Arnobius, Lactantius and Tertullian.

The golden age of patristic literature (313-461), the age of the mighty Greek Fathers, St. Athanasius, Cyril, Basil, the Gregories, Epiphanius and Chrysostom, of St. Ephrem in Syria, of Jerome, Augustine, Cassian, Leo the Great, Hilary in the West, is thoroughly reviewed and the reader gets a complete view of the great theological battles waged in the Church and a life-like sketch of the great captains who led the fray and championed the cause of truth. In his last sections, the author studies the writers of the period of decline of patristic literature and closes the book with the figure of the great Isidore of Seville, who in many ways recalls the power and the learning of the golden age of Augustine, Jerome and Chrysostom.

Father Tixeront has written what he modestly calls a handbook. But, though concise and rapid, and dealing with such seemingly abstruse subjects as grace, gnosticism, montanism, Arianism, Pelagianism, the book throbs with life and actuality. The student of Church history, for whom the work of Bardenhewer may be too long and that of Schmidt too brief, will find in the present volume a valuable help for the difficult but all-important study of the Fathers.

J. C. R.

Catiline—His Conspiracy. By BEN JONSON. Edited with Introduction, Notes and Glossary by LYNN HAROLD HARRIS, Ph.D. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Caius Gracchus. By ODIN GREGORY. With an Introduction by THEODORE DREISER. New York: Boni & Liveright.

Mr. Lynn Harold Harris presented this edition of "Catiline—His Conspiracy," as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Yale University. The work is evidently the product of long and scholarly toil. The text is printed in the original spelling of the 1616 edition. There is an introduction on editions of the play, date, stage history and literary relationships together with some critical estimates of the play. The notes to the text are exhaustive, including references to Cicero, Sallust, Lucan and all the other classical authors, which Jonson used as sources, besides explanations of Jonson's use of words.

"Caius Gracchus" is an entirely new, and in some ways, an entirely unconventional drama. The subject, it is true, is older than the basis of "Julius Caesar" but the treatment is different. In this drama we see the adversaries of Caius Gracchus laying

snare for him at the very beginning of the action, while the defeat of Gracchus ends the entire tragedy. The conventional drama writer would have continued the play until the downfall of the enemies of Gracchus. Odin Gregory is unconventional, too, in having the scenes coincide with the acts except in the last act. Thus there are five acts and six scenes. The central character Gracchus is a powerful figure with whom we cannot help sympathizing. His wife Licinia is also a strong character. Caius Fannius and Lucius Opimius, consuls, are foils for Gracchus. Even the minor characters are vivid personalities. In his treatment of the love elements, especially the passion of Rutilius for the daughter of Antyllus, the author offends against morals in showing too much sex-consciousness and in describing too alluringly the dissolute deeds and desires of the gilded youth of Rome. If in the next edition of the play the sex-lure is minimized and the long speeches cut here and there, the tragedy will increase in tragic intensity and appeal.

A. G. B.

Sermons. By P. A. CANON SHEEHAN, D.D., Edited by M. J. PHELAN, S.J. New York: Benziger Brothers. \$3.00.

The Ecclesiastical Year. Contemplations on the Deeper Meaning and Relation of Its Seasons and Feasts. By the Rev. JOHN RICKABY, S.J. New York: Joseph F. Wagner (Inc.).

The admirers of "Luke Delmege's" creator are sure to be interested in the late Canon Sheehan's "Charity Sermon," "On Scandal" and "The Conversion of St. Augustine." There are some twenty-five discourses besides on the high feasts of Our Divine Lord and His Blessed Mother which are composed with all the oratorical skill, literary charm and winning piety that the author has taught his readers to expect from him. Included in the volume are some "effusions of his youth," sermons written on the English missions where the presence of converts and Protestant critics made the young Irish priest work hard at his sermons. Canon Sheehan's discourse on the centenary celebration of the Kilkenny Presentation nuns and on "St. Alphonsus Liguori's Centenary" are excellent "occasional" sermons.

There is a wealth of solid learning in Father Rickaby's book. He takes twenty of the chief festivals of the Church's year and sets down with the effectiveness of a practised writer the results of his readings and reflections on them. Holy Writ, the Fathers, theology, philosophy, history and the classics all yield a wealth of well-digested material which those with sermons to prepare should find of great assistance. The volume will also stimulate thought in priests and religious who make the great feasts of the year the matter of their meditations. Father Rickaby's reflections on the value of Plato's "Sophrosyne" to the Christian, for example, are as full of sound asceticism as of solid learning.

W. D.

And the Kaiser Abdicates. By S. MILES BOUTON. New Haven: Yale University Press. \$2.50.

A journalist who was on the spot gives in this book a very thorough account of the German Revolution. Information hitherto withheld from the general public crops out from every page. The reader will gain more knowledge of the revolutionary movement not only in Germany but throughout the world from a few chapters of this book than can be gained from the partisan accounts appearing in the continental and American press. Mr. Bouton gives the true story of the growth of Bolshevik propaganda. Imperial Germany trifled with Bolshevism to destroy Russia and Bolshevism returned to destroy Imperial Germany. The effect of Allied and American propaganda on the German nation is well brought out. Propaganda and hunger went hand in hand with the result that military and civil morale weakened and the Allied victory was inevitable. Then came revolution with all its possibilities. Just what these possibilities may mean depends on the policy followed by the nations who

at present are controlling world affairs. As Mr. Wilson pointed out in the course of the war the days have passed when peoples can be handled like pawns. Mr. Bouton proves very clearly that the people everywhere are roused to a sense of their power and that the nation forgetting this is doomed to a violent awakening.

The author also shows how far from being a real settlement of world affairs the present Covenant is. To say that it is the best peace possible is only to avoid the issue. It is rooted in hatred and revenge and its conditions can never be fulfilled by Germany. Had the spirit of the Fourteen Points prevailed at Paris modern Germany would be in a hopeful condition. And it is important to remember that Germany's condition is bound to affect the condition of the world.

G. C. T.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

History and Biography.—"Plymouth and the Pilgrims" is a discussion on the influence of the Mayflower journey on our American nation, by Arthur Lord. (Houghton Mifflin, \$1.50). The spirit of intolerance that characterized the Pilgrim colony is rather lightly passed over, and while there is an historical tone to the book there is the usual amount of fulsome praise of Pilgrim characteristics. To judge from the literature that has appeared during the tercentenary celebration, there is nothing good in the American philosophy of government that did not spring from the Pilgrim rock. It is fortunate that history began before the Pilgrims, else some enthusiast would be ready to state that it took its origin from Plymouth.—Anyone interested in Myles Standish and his lost lands will be fully informed by reading "Captain Myles Standish," by T. C. Porteus. (Manchester University Press). Everything about the Standish family is carefully treated with historical accuracy. The little book will be of interest to the descendants of the Pilgrim warrior if he has any.—The life of Paul Revere is the basis of a very good story by Walter A. Dyer. "Sons of Liberty" gives the American Revolution with Paul Revere as a leading figure. (Henry Holt, \$1.75). At the close of the story the author gives the historic facts connected with his romance and the authoritative sources whence the facts are drawn. The principles for which the Colonists fought are woven into the story with accuracy and telling force, and no American boy reader will miss the lesson the book teaches. The Revolution was no misunderstanding as some propagandists would have it. It was a clash of principles, and it illustrated two distinct theories of government.

For Catholic Children.—"Mary Virginia Merrick's "The Altar of God, a Story Book of the Mass for Children" (Paulist Press, \$1.50) pleasantly conducts little worshipers through the ordinary of the Holy Sacrifice, explaining the sacred liturgy and clinching important doctrines by means of stories and anecdotes. Little Rose, for instance, who was given to nodding at Mass, heard the Angels "talking things over" and grieving because only one child had really been at Mass that day. "You all came in but you soon went out again, one to the fields, one to last night's party and several to the movies, though your bodies stayed in the pews all the time." The volume is well illustrated and Father John Burke writes the preface.—"The Story Ever New" (Macmillan), by the Rev. James Higgins, is the life of Our Divine Saviour arranged as a text-book for children of the grade schools. Paraphrasing or quoting the words of the New Testament characters, and describing in simple language the miracles of Christ, the author has produced a text-book that should hold the interest of our boys and girls. Pictures, suggestions on the text and excellent notes increase the value of the book.—A Sister of Notre Dame has written a dozen true stories about "First Communion Days" (Herder, \$0.75) which Wilfred Peppett has illustrated. Catechists and teachers will find the little book useful.

The Current "Studies."—In an article on "Progress," which opens the December *Studies*, Mr. Hilaire Belloc examines the chaotic notions of such writers on the subject as Dean Inge, Mr. Wells, Dr. Bury and Mr. Frazer of "Golden Bough" repute, and shows that the "superstition of progress" is largely due to "the decay of religion forcing men back on a temporal hope which they turned into a belief, the neglect of philosophy and the corresponding exaggeration of the physical sciences and the effect of wealth and comfort in the small class which monopolized speculation." The second paper in the number is a discerning appraisal of Terence MacSwiney's character by Daniel Corkery. He sums up the Lord Mayor's career as follows:

He was an idealist. His view of life, as expressed in all his writings, was that, life could be heightened, on and on, for evermore. . . . We have as yet but roughly, very roughly, estimated his martyrdom. We will never know it. Yet those who went to see him lying on his bed of torture came home to us dazzled at the constant activity of his mind, at the serenity of his spirit. In those long hours that he lay there on his death-bed, what thoughts must have come to him, what places must have flashed on his inner eye, what reckonings as to how the end would at last come! For all of us there was one constant consolation—that those who were about him—his wife, his sisters and brothers, as well as his faithful chaplain, Father Dominic, were all worthy of himself.

Other important papers in the number are James Winder Good's "British Labor and Irish Needs"; Alfred O'Rahilly's "The Law of Nations," and Mary Curran's "Impressions of Zurich," the citizens of which, she avers, are so exceedingly "highbrow" that "if an angel were to appear to a Zurich assembly and announce that a door on his right led to Paradise, whilst one on his left led to a lecture on paradise, the great majority would most assuredly troop in through the door on the left."

"AE" on MacSwiney.—George Russell, the Irish poet and publicist, was inspired by Terence MacSwiney's heroic death to write this sonnet on "Brixton Prison":

See, though the oil be low, more purely still and higher
The flame burns in the body's lamp! The watchers still
Gaze with unseeing eyes while the Promethean will,
The Uncreated Light, the Everlasting Fire,
Sustains itself against the torturers' desire
Even as the fabled Titan chained upon the hill.
Burn on, shine here, thou immortality, until
We too have lit our lamps at the funeral pyre;
Till we too can be noble, unshakable, undismayed:
Till we too can burn with the holy flame, and know
There is that within us can triumph over pain,
And go to death alone, slowly and unafraid.
The candles of God are already burning row on row.
Farewell, Lightbringer, fly to thy heaven again.

And René Fiallo sent the *Nation* this tribute to "Mrs. Terence MacSwiney":

The lagging days, the somber prison wall,
The strangled love, the silent, soft despair
The sweet nun's whisper, the unrelenting care
For flesh stubborn to the spirit's call;
The slow decay, the ever-present gall
Of foemen's footsteps and a doctor's stare—
Are fled at last, and the wan features bear
Once more God's peace beneath their sickly pall.
Rejoice, grim martyr! With thy dying breath,
Behold the fierce red embers on the hearth
Of Erin, fly over a world inflamed;
While breaking in God's thunder out of death,
Thy name now smites the foreheads unashamed
Of those who slay His liberty on earth.

For Catholic Sociologists.—The latest of the valuable "Catholic Manuals for Social Students" to reach us is Margaret Fletcher's excellent booklet on "The Christian Family" (Oxford Catholic Social Guild) which is well adapted for use as a study club's text-book. In ten short chapters the author dis-

cusses such important topics as "The Essential Characteristic of the Christian Family," "Family Life in the XIII Century," "The Modern Family," "The Position of Women in the Christian Home," and "The Family and Divorce." The chapter on "The Limited Family: Its Effect on Character" is particularly good. Indeed the entire booklet is a cogently reasoned indictment of modern paganism which Catholic students of sociology will find stocked with effective weapons.—The Rev. John J. O'Gorman's "Divorce in Canada, an Appeal to Protestants" and the Rev. Dr. D. McBride's "Christian Marriage a Sacrament" (Catholic Truth Society of Canada, 67 Bond St., Toronto) are pamphlets which forcibly present the Church's teaching on these important subjects and strengthening arguments drawn from history, sociology and economics are added. Dr. McBride's pamphlet seems reminiscent, here and there, of "Courtship and Marriage" (America Press, \$0.25).—"The Menace to Christian Education" (Fordham University Committee, New York) is a strong pamphlet written by H. G. Andrews, apropos of the Fordham Drive, to make Catholics realize how much we need greater facilities for the higher education of our youths and maidens, if the Church is to do its share in safeguarding American institutions.—"Teaching for God" (Loyola Univ. Press, Chicago) is the title of Father Garesche's stirring appeal for vocations to the teaching congregations.

EDUCATION

The Government and Education

ON the evening of December 15, 1920, in an address delivered before a State meeting of the Child Conservation League of the Methodist Episcopal church at Marion, President-elect Harding reiterated his approval of the proposed Public Welfare Department. Since his election, he said, he had discussed the proposal, with reference to its legislative accomplishment, with leaders of liberal thought in and out of Congress, and had found them eager to help in the task. He then went on to say:

Its accomplishment will tardily place our Government on something like an equal footing, in recognition of this set of problems, with governments which have long maintained ministries of education represented in their cabinets. While my own ideal envisages a broader scope for the new department, giving it concern with many other phases of human welfare, it is interesting to know that its creation will for the first time place this great work on a phase of dignity comparable to that given it in many other countries.

Whether we may esteem it wise or unwise, the modern mother must realize that society disposes more and more to take from her control the training, the intellectual direction and the spiritual guidance of her children. We may well plead with the mothers to make the most, for good, of the lessened opportunity they possess for molding the lives and minds of their children. Through such cooperative effort as this, it seems to me, there is opportunity for a great service. Herein is presented the opportunity to lift up the poorer and the less fortunate to a higher level.

So, whether the executive who is to guide the destinies of our country during the coming four years confesses a leaning towards paternalism or not, in his Marion address he clearly states that he realizes the proximity of the danger, and is willing to make compromise with it. And not only in regard to social and intellectual training, but also in "the spiritual guidance of her children" must the mother weakly allow the State to steal away at least part of her natural prerogative.

THE DANGER AT OUR DOORS

WE have had this question of the educational peril at our doors drummed into our ears day in and day out, until sheer fatigue mayhap will lead us to suspect that the guardian of the flock is jokingly crying, "Wolf!" when there really is no danger. But if an apathetic attitude had begun to overtake any of us, the recognition of the danger by so prominent a personage as the President-elect will arouse us with a start. For one of the main bulwarks upon which the whole moral and

religious sense of mankind depends is right education; and we believe that that education can only be obtained by securing to the parents care over and direction of those children whom they have brought into the world, and for whose immortal souls they are immediately responsible to God.

Dr. P. P. Claxton, the United States Commissioner of Education, upon whose supposedly authoritative statements the Smith-Towner bill and all the arguments of the proponents of government control of education rest, likewise speaks in the December *World's Work* for diminution of parental control over children. Appealing for more funds for kindergartens, he says:

The idea of small children being cared for by their mothers up to school age is appealing, but powerful economic forces make this impossible for a multitude of families. This is especially true of the important industrial centres, in fact of great cities in general. Women face the necessity of doing work that takes them away from their children, whether they like it or not. The children must not be left to themselves, or at best to the casual attention of friends or relatives. A prompt expansion of kindergarten facilities is the only remedy for the situation. There are 4,000,000 children of kindergarten age in the United States.

To which the only answer necessary is the bromide: "woman's place is in the home." But how are we going to keep women in the home? It is, unfortunately, only too true that in many instances the wife and mother has, by her labor in factory or mill, to supplement the earnings of father and husband, in order to eke out a barely sufficient living for the family. But what is the remedy?

SOCIAL JUSTICE

TO say, with Dr. Claxton, that "a prompt expansion of kindergarten facilities is the only remedy for the situation" is no more reasonable than to assert that the pumping of air into a corpse will restore life, or that turning the ocean into a hole drilled to the middle of the earth will soothe the parched lips of Dives and his companions in the flames of hell. The trouble lies far deeper than that, but the answer has been given time and again by Catholic and other economists. It is founded upon the dignity of labor, and it consists in the simple formula: "The laborer, in return for his labor, is entitled to a fair living wage." And here is where we have need of that cooperative effort which the President-elect urges, and of the revival of religious spirit which he also recommends in the same address, saying: "There never was a time when the world stood in more need than it does now, of the consolations and reassurances which only a firm religious faith can have."

For both capital and labor must come to realize that only harmonious cooperation and mutual giving of best efforts can solve the economic and social problems that now disturb us. The laborer must be taught that, while he deserves a just wage, he is also constrained in conscience to give a just amount of labor in return. Dr. Claxton, in that same article, declares that our educational crisis, for its cure, needs three billions of dollars a year for five years. If only a small fraction of that amount were devoted to right legislative and social effort, the problems that now confront the country would be well on the way to solution.

STATE CONTROL HARMFUL

BUT the training of children must ever be the inviolable privilege and duty of the parents; that principle we must hold firmly. Of course, as Frank E. Spaulding, formerly superintendent of schools in Cleveland, Ohio, states in a recent zealous defense of Government control of education in the *Atlantic Monthly*, "the content, the quality, and the language of instruction in schools, private as well as public, are matters of concern to others than the children and their parents; they are of deepest concern to the community, the state, and the nation." The school children of today are the citizens of tomorrow, and the State has a right to insure the inculcation of principles that will

make them valuable citizens, an asset to the community. But for this we need not go so far as to remove all parental control from the child, and to place it under the complete educational guidance of a paternalistic State. For in this manner we may, perhaps, fashion an intellectual and social machine that will function perfectly as long as it stays in the right groove, as long as the combination of circumstances in which it has been trained does not go awry. But we will never obtain that culture of head and heart that goes to make up the really educated person, a person who realizes that he must do right and avoid wrong, not merely because science or etiquette or social custom tells him that he must act so, but because he realizes that there is a Supreme Being to whom he is personally responsible for all, even his most secret actions.

THE CRISIS OF PATERNALISM

IT is only the old-style personal training, education with a soul, that can accomplish this consummation. We have sufficient illustration of the perfect State training in the boy of Sparta who allowed the fox concealed within his tunic to eat out his vitals; while we admire, we pity and condemn. While the common good sometimes gains ascendancy over the rights of the individual, we must not habitually sacrifice the individual to the State.

Here all of us must make a firm stand. The recent decision of the Joint Legislative Commission on Education of the New York Legislature seems to be a step in the right direction; namely, that control of the schools should be vested, not in appointed boards of education, but in bodies directly elected by the people. A Legislature of members from all parts of the State cannot be familiar with school matters in every particular community. Representative Sterling of Philadelphia is sponsoring a similar movement in Pennsylvania.

Apposite here is "Uncle Joe" Cannon's comment on a proposed bill to have the Government engineers make surveys of arid Western lands for private interests. With a stamp of his foot, the veteran Congressman said: "I am against the Government becoming too paternalistic. Why, some folks seem to want the Government to do everything, even the bearing of children!"

ANTHONY M. BENEDIK, D.D.

SOCIOLOGY

The War Against the Labor Unions

WE have recently brought to its conclusion a great war fought we were told, for the maintenance of democracy. That war ended, as Edgar Lee Masters among others has observed, with democracy no whit bettered abroad, and well-nigh destroyed at home.

After the war for democracy, with its disappointing result, we face in America the war between the captains of finance and the unnamed millions who eke out an existence in the sweat of their brows. In the end, this conflict may be beneficial. It may put beyond dispute the question whether an almost inconsiderable minority may hold in legal fee a majority of the natural resources of wealth. It may destroy the present economic system which divides a people, by supposition, equal, into classes more distinct and hostile than the serf and aristocrat of pre-revolutionary France. But the conclusion, if it must be reached by war, will be a bitter conflict, and the losers will drink the dregs.

THE PURPOSE OF THE CAPITALIST

SWIFTLY-MOVING events of the last four weeks show clearly that the masters of capital and the labor unions are alike preparing for war. The field is the "open shop." Honest followers of both parties know well what the term should mean. But in the past, the unions as well as the capitalists have been guilty of muddying the wells. One faction has regarded the open shop as a shop open only to non-union workers, the other

as a shop open only to members of a union. But I do not see how the conclusion can now be escaped that the capitalists, taking skilful advantage of the popular leaning to the genuine open shop, are preparing to destroy not only the union as it now exists, but all free associations of workers. That is, they are willing to allow and even recognize unions which are merely "paper associations," combinations which have no protective power whatever, or the so-called "unions" financed and dominated by themselves. It cannot be denied, I think, that for some years, local unions have too often submitted without question to foolish, irresponsible, incompetent, and even, it would appear, dishonest leaders. This unfortunate leadership has done more to discredit the union before the public than could have been effected by the most skilful and unprincipled capitalistic propaganda. In the eyes of thousands, a union contract has come to mean a contract terminable at will by the walking-delegate, and a union job to mean a job that will be attended by vexatious delays and exasperating conditions, resulting in inferior work at exorbitant prices.

Frankly, the public does not look upon the union as an association determined to better the condition of the worker by demanding from its members, and providing for the public, the best work at the fairest price. The American people cannot understand why a premium should be put upon shiftlessness, and a check upon thrift and industry, by the limitation of production, and by the insistence that a union man be invested with prerogatives and an immunity denied the worker who refuses to affiliate with a union. They know that an association which does not foster thrift, self-reliance, initiative and honesty, but tolerates their opposites, is no better than a gang of thieves or a round of thugs, and many Americans incline to place the union in one or both of these congregations. This, I think, reflects fairly well the opinion of the union held by countless Americans. For this opinion they can find grounds in plenty. I do not think it a just opinion. It seems to me that the many are suffering for the incompetency or downright dishonesty of the few.

LABOR ASSOCIATIONS NECESSARY

NEVERTHELESS, with the indictment against the union accepted as proved, the necessity, particularly at this time and in this country, of a strong, vigorous, aggressive combination of the workers, remains wholly untouched. This conclusion flows, as it seems to me, not only from the law written in man's very nature, but more clearly from the pronouncements registered in the Encyclicals of Leo XIII, in the Reconstruction Program of the Bishops, and in the writings of the majority of those social students who approach the subject from the ethical and religious angle, with bias toward neither capital nor labor. In a day when capital is both aggressive and powerful, associations of the workers for mutual protection are an absolute necessity.

The claim made by capitalists that in "questions of dispute" they will treat with their workers individually, or in acceptable groups, seems on its face, just. In plain language and in everyday practice, it is pure twaddle. You can believe it justice as soon as you can believe that ignorant, frightened, embittered Felix Wojciechowski can present his case, single-handed and without counsel, against the steel trust, represented by a battery of the keenest corporation lawyers in the country. But not before. What Felix believes to be "a question of dispute" will at once be ruled out as a matter in no wise affecting Felix, since it embodies the settled policy of the company and its allies. "We have nothing to arbitrate." Felix is free to quit the job, if he likes, and entrain in his private Pullman, with the directors, for Palm Beach, or Felix and his family may starve. But the "settled policy" of the company must not be disturbed. Felix and his wife and his children are only human beings, a

cheap commodity, whereas a company is an association for making money, to be protected at all hazards.

Between parties so unequally matched as an ignorant worker and the law department of a five hundred million dollar corporation, there is rarely even the possibility of a free contract. The perpetuation of this condition will be one result if the capitalists succeed in wrecking the full right of the worker to make himself felt through an organization. It was one of the English martyrs, I think, who, on an Elizabethan rack, was challenged to a debate by a full-fed minister of the State religion. He replied that he would accept gladly were he taken off the rack or the minister put on. The worker is on the rack. The capitalist is not. The capitalist can tide over a long period of non-productivity. He has reserve funds. The worker cannot. He has no reserve, or but a small one. Usually he is but two or three days in advance of destitution. When the worker submits to hard conditions because he can get no better, he is not a free agent, but, as Leo XIII has said, *the victim of fraud and injustice*.

THE AIM OF THE LABOR ASSOCIATION

THE chief aim of the labor union has been to establish and maintain conditions allowing the worker the unrestrained right of free contract. I do not claim that the leaders of the union movement have always worked wisely or even honestly toward this end; but I for one fail to understand how under the capitalistic system which now dominates the country, the worker, if he relies on his own resources alone, can enter into a genuine, as opposed to a forced, contract. Some kind of a union, absolutely removed from the control or even influence of the capitalist, must be maintained. By consequence, I am unable to understand how any honest man will refuse to align himself with the forces now at work to secure for the laborer a living-wage and a full chance to advance. That, of course, is only the first step, but it will be a great step. We cannot attain real peace before an equitable copartnership controlling the sources of wealth has been secured, together with a safe guarantee that these sources can never pass into the hands of a minority.

This last proposition is not Socialism. It is Christianity. The present economic system, which not only allows, but fosters, the pooling and merging of capital, kills charity and makes of justice a mockery. Wealth debases man, and puts into his debased hands a power over his fellows which ruins him and makes them little better than slaves. Of this fact, the inspired words of Holy Writ, the teachings of Our Blessed Lord and His Apostles, as well as the bitter experience of these times, bear irrefragable proof.

A WAR DOCUMENT

IT will be instructive here to append extracts from a declaration of war against the union, signed by the Cramps Shipyards of Philadelphia. The declaration is perhaps the clearest and, ostensibly, the fairest, of a number of similar documents.

We have decided . . . to deal directly with our own employes on and after January 1, 1921. We are convinced that closer and more satisfactory relations can be maintained between you and ourselves by direct intercourse, rather than through individuals disinterested in the welfare of the plant and ignorant of practical shipbuilding, but more concerned over self-advancement and self-gain.

We are indifferent as to whether our employes are members of labor organizations or not. Non-discrimination will be practised by us, and we insist that our employes shall act in a similar manner. . . . *We shall receive our individual employes for conference when they desire.* (Italics inserted.)

It would be interesting to know precisely how many of the legal representatives of this corporation, and how many of its directors, are "ignorant of practical shipbuilding" and unconcerned "over self-advancement and self-gain," and, in particular, how

many of these gentlemen are acquainted with the hard lot now faced by the laborer. Interesting too will be the results when, utterly unrepresented by counsel and completely stripped of the aid afforded by the consciousness that their fellows are banded with them, one by one the workers in Cramp's Shipyards troop in to present their grievances. I do not ask that Cramp be put on the rack. But I demand that, before the debate, the worker be taken off.

P. L. B.

NOTE AND COMMENT

Progress of St. Louis University Centennial Endowment Fund

THE campaign to raise \$3,000,000 as a centennial endowment fund for the St. Louis University is progressing satisfactorily. The most notable donation was that made by the State organization of the Knights of Columbus which pledged itself to contribute \$250,000. Two meetings of the Missouri Grand Knights of this organization, one for the eastern and one for the western section of the State, were recently held to devise ways and means of quickly raising the promised sum. The number of students at the university is now 2618, while there is a faculty of 234 members, consisting largely of full-time lay professors. As an interesting fact it may here be noted that the number of active participants in the educational life within the university walls is now as great as was the total of the inhabitants of St. Louis itself at the time when this institution was founded, more than a hundred years ago.

The Good Old Times

SOMEONE recently unearthed an old account book showing the prices paid by its owner in 1843. The figures given are such as to make one weep for the good old days, says the San Francisco *Star*. A dozen eggs are entered at three cents, butter at eight cents a pound, coffee at ten cents, cheese at ten cents, and chickens at ten cents each. Lumber was one cent a foot. A pair of shoes cost \$1.37, a rather expensive item, and slippers, sixty-two cents. But the present-day worker and employer will read with slightly different sentiments the entry which registers: "Credit for one day's work, fifty cents." That day's work, as the *Star* suggests, may have meant from twelve to fourteen hours. The good old time of 'Forty-three were not all golden, and yet fifty cents sufficed to lay in a fairly good supply when eggs were three cents a dozen, and the hens themselves that laid them could be bought at ten cents each.

M. P. T. Merit Seal for "Movies"

A COUNTRY-WIDE campaign against objectionable moving pictures was determined upon in the recent meeting of the Motion Picture League for Better Pictures, presided over by Charles A. McMahon, head of the motion-picture bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Council. Particularly practical was the suggestion of a merit seal to be placed upon such pictures as can be safely shown to all. A committee consisting of one member of the Motion Picture Theatrical Association, one theatrical representative, and one member each of the Catholic, Protestant and Jewish denominations was at once appointed. Its duty will be to outline plans for the establishment of a reviewing and information commission. It is to examine the various films and make public its judgment upon them. The committee consists of John A. Quinn, president of the M. P. T. A.; Frank Bacon, representing the theatrical profession; Mrs. Sidney Berg, of the Federated Jewish Women; Dr. Robert

Watson, of the National Federation of International Reform Bureau, representing the Protestant Churches; and Charles A. McMahon, of the National Catholic Welfare Council. It was also proposed to urge a reduction in the price of admission so that entire families might more frequently be able to attend the productions. Immediate action is to be taken.

A Commissioner and the Smith Bill

SPEAKING before a gathering of Methodist clergymen in Providence, Rhode Island, on January 8, Hon. Walter E. Ranger, State Commissioner of Education, seized the unusual occasion to pay a merited tribute to Catholic schools, and to point out the serious dangers connected with the "iniquitous" Smith-Towner bill. "This bill," said the Commissioner, voicing a criticism which is equally true of the amended bill, "would center education in Washington, and thus 'Prussianize' education." The Commissioner also believes with Senator Thomas of Colorado, that the ultimate effect of the bill will be to merge all schools, public and private, into one great governmental monopoly. As reported by the Providence *Visitor*, Mr. Ranger thus concluded:

I haven't seen the time when we might favorably force all the children into the public school. I haven't brought myself to the support of the Smith-Towner bill, or any bill such as was proposed and recently defeated in Michigan.

The attempt made by such associations as the National Education Association to raise a religious issue in connection with the discussion of this pending legislation is nothing less than contemptible, and is recognized as such by real Americans. Such tactics are in keeping with the bill itself; for nothing more hostile to the letter and spirit of the Constitution, and more destructive of American ideals, has ever been presented at Washington. It is hoped that every reader of *AMERICA* will range himself with Dr. Hadley of Yale, President Hibben and Dean West of Princeton, President Kinley of Illinois, and other prominent educators, and let his representatives at Washington know at once his opposition to this crude, un-American piece of legislation.

Our Catholic German-Language Publications

AFTER seventy years of devoted and meritorious Catholic journalism the St. Louis *Herold des Glaubens* has been fused with the semi-weekly edition of the daily *Amerika*. Both papers had for some time past been issued from the same address, yet the disappearance of the *Herold des Glaubens* as an independent publication calls for a special notice. Its founders were among the early protagonists of the Catholic press in America, and it has always held an honored place in Catholic journalism. Some interesting information regarding the Catholic papers published in the German language in the United States is given in this connection by the editor of the St. Paul *Wanderer*, a German Catholic paper which itself is now in its fifty-fourth year. Older than this are the *Aurora*, founded 1851, but combined during the last twenty years with the *Christliche Woche*, and also the Chicago *Katholische Wochenblatt* (1860) and the Louisville *Katholische Glaubensbote* (1866). Four German papers ceased publication immediately before or during the war. At present two Catholic German dailies still remain in the United States, the ably edited *Amerika* and the Buffalo *Volksfreund*. The latter, as the editor of the *Wanderer* remarks, is not specifically a Catholic paper, although published by Catholics. It is meant to serve a general need. Besides these there are thirteen Catholic weeklies and about half a dozen monthly publications in the German language, all of which supply a real necessity both for the Church and the country. At a time

when revolutionary literature of every kind is being distributed broadcast among our workers of foreign birth or descent it is of the utmost importance for the preservation of the Faith and for the safety of our nation that we should be able to counteract this propaganda in all the languages in which it reaches the people. The Government has fully appreciated this fact, although chauvenist patriots have unfortunately been willing to bite off their own nose to spite their face. The country owes a great debt of gratitude to its Catholic foreign-language publications, and the day has not arrived when it can dispense with them. But their number is naturally and constantly diminishing as the old generation dies away. Few new Catholic journals in the German language have arisen to take the place of the stalwart veteran publications that fought their fight and passed out of existence. Theirs, at all events, was the consolation that flows from the knowledge of a duty well performed.

Why Socialist Mayor Leaves Party

DR. C. E. BAREWALD, elected on the Socialist ticket by one of the largest majorities ever accorded a mayoralty candidate in Davenport, Ia., recently resigned from the Socialist party. Six years of practical experience convinced him that Socialism was in reality a serious danger to the nation. In a special despatch to the New York *Herald* he says:

Today radicals of the most violent type, men who are a menace to society and who should be confined in asylums as monomaniacs, control the councils of the party and dominate the members to the detriment of the latter. In any case where the Socialist extremists have obtained power in government disaster has been the price paid for the experiment and it has taken years to recover from the effects.

Whether Socialism is losing strength throughout the country is a matter for conjecture, but wherever it has been tried there is no doubt about it, and adherents who flocked to the party lured by the honeyed words and sweet promises of the agitators, have learned the bitter lesson that all that glitters is not gold. These, disappointed, are gradually dropping away.

He is perfectly correct in his conclusion that it is but one step from ardent Socialism to rabid Bolshevism. "Wherever you see a fanatic Socialist there is an embryonic Bolshevik." Bolshevism is but Czarism under another form, and he would not see the crimson banner of blood take the place of the American flag. He adds:

Intellectuality and morality, in the eyes of the radical leaders, are fit subjects for sneers and laughter, and these same radicals offer as a substitute a form of communism absolutely material, with no spiritual or moral foundation. These theories if actually carried out, naturally, according to the Socialist spellbinder, mean the immediate annihilation of personal ownership of capital. Annihilation of the family and eventually of civilization would follow as a matter of course.

Socialistic principles of free love are not adopted by the devotee through accident, but by the sequence in which the teachings are propounded and absorbed by the novice. The movement that no man shall have the right to what he owns proceeds naturally from material property to ethereal emotion.

Dr. Barewald keenly analyzes the Socialist movement when he says that Socialism is merely individualism in disguise: "Nearly every Socialist, while declaiming that he is an apostle of socialization, is in reality an individualist of the rankest type. He speaks loudly of humanity, and thinks first of himself." Socialism, Dr. Barewald concludes, can best be fought by ignoring it, by registering a determined protest against all social injustice, and finally by supplying adequate correctives to the present-day evils, creating, so far as possible, equal opportunities for all that they may display their true worth and reap a fitting reward.